

The Channel Islands And Land Tenure.

1919

Sas.
Librarian
Uttarpara Joykrishna Public Library
Govt. of West Bengal

then, have been the polestar of their thoughts and affections. Their lives would have centred in the spot which gave them a safe resting-place, which was their castle against the world. But nothing of the kind can ever be theirs. They will never be able to call so much of the world their own as to set their feet on. The world may be a very pleasant place for others, but it can only be a very hard place for them: upon it they can never be more than strangers and pilgrims. Home is an abiding-place; what the heart of man most of all longs for; the first requirement of the family; that which of all that man can possess most humanises; but that is precisely what they never can have, or hope to have. Neither possession nor hope can in this matter ever come to them. The most universal, the most abiding, the most effectual, the most self-acting of all educating influences, those of home, are well-nigh utterly excluded from their schooling.

This is so, even if the tenement that never can be their own, and in which they dwell, be a structure in which the decencies of family life are possible. Of course we know that in our villages it is still possible for it to be a hovel that one would deem unfit even for the stabling of cattle, and that in our towns it is not unfrequently a single room, or a cellar, family life in which is not only an imperative prohibition of all the civilising and humanising influences of a home, but also the imperative enforcement of all that is most uncivilising and unhumanising. Here, then, in the very focus of civilisation, are multitudes of people in a worse position, as respects the first essential of civilisation, the home, than a tribe of savages, each family of which at all events has its own wigwam. The man or woman must indeed be a miracle of virtue, who is able to fight successfully against the deteriorating influences of such a dwelling. The improvements which have of late years been very widely effected in the cottages of our agricultural labourers, and the Act of last Session for the improvement of the dwellings of the industrial classes in our large towns, are indications that in this matter we have begun to move in the right direction. What, however, we ought to set before us as our ultimate aim is to make a true home possible for, to place it within the attainment of, every family in the country. Hitherto, legislation has inadvertently made it impossible. No law has yet been enacted with the view of bringing land and homes within the reach of the agricultural labourer.

The evils of hovel and cellar life, of which wife-kicking and intemperance are only the most obtrusive, neither flogging nor fines nor imprisonment will remedy. Such treatment may repress some symptoms, but cannot touch the disease. That consists in the bad feelings which have been engendered by the utter overthrow of family life. What overthrew it, or rendered it impossible at the beginning, was the war



3.46
3577

poor wretches have no idea of their ever being able to recover what they have lost, or indeed any idea of their having sustained any loss, for they have no conception of any other kind of life than that which they have lived, and are living, being possible for them. No one can suppose that they will ever be unbrutalised by the lash, by fines, and by imprisonment, any more than that the fear of these penalties could make them resist the allurements of the public-house, or of the gin palace, or enable them to estimate rightly the value of their children's schooling. And this brings us round again to the point which suggested what has been said about property and home. That point was that we had now reached a stage in the progress of society when schools for all had become a necessity, but that having established these schools, the first fact that was forced on our attention is, that we have no security that with the majority of those taught the powers conferred would be—and that is what we want—rightly used, or that a large proportion of the children would, after they had left school, make any effort to retain what they had been taught. This security no laws or churches can give us. It can be the result only of the action upon these classes of the circumstances in which they find themselves placed. I do not at all mean to imply that direct moral instruction given in the school would be valueless: on the contrary, I believe that something would be gained if all children were merely taught the half-dozen words Forethought, Thrift, Industry, Kindness, Truth, Self-dependence, and what they mean. But besides the knowledge, and the degree of habituation, which may be obtained at school, something more is needed for our purpose; and my contention is that this something more never has been found, and cannot now be found, in anything except in the natural motives which are engendered unfailingly in all men's minds by the use and the pursuit of property, especially when it includes the actual possession, or the prospective acquisition, of a home. Make property in land, without which speaking generally true homes are impossible, accessible to our working classes, and the first step, which in this matter as in so many others will be the most difficult, will have been taken. How much time may be required for undoing the work of centuries, during which property has been becoming to them less and less accessible, and homes less and less possible, and for these great natural instructors have been substituted the teachings of the poor law, no one can foresee. Our system has hitherto tended in the wrong direction. In that direction it can now advance no further, and so therefore the tide may be about to turn. If it be otherwise, our schools will not do us all the good we are expecting from them; they may even assist the working classes in coming to the conclusion that the order of society which puts hindrances in the way of their attaining to property and securing homes, is not fair to them.

In the foregoing paper I have not said anything with the view of promoting a compulsory *morcellement* of the land, or for limiting, or in any way interfering with, our existing liberty of devising land to our immediate successors; indeed, I should be glad to see this liberty so complete as to allow to every holder of land in the United Kingdom power of leaving it absolutely to whom, and in what proportions, he pleased. In this era of capital and of science, our agriculture should in the main be scientific, which would involve the application to the land of a much larger amount of capital than its present mode of culture admits. We have both the science and the capital, and our agriculture stands much in need of both. What keeps them from the land is our present landlord-and-tenant system, or in other words our territorial system, which is the inevitable sequel of the monstrous permission to settle and charge the property of a coming generation. Neither landlords nor tenants can do much, speaking of the country generally, to promote costly and scientific modes of culture. What is required for this purpose is estates of one or two thousand acres each, owned by the individual or by the joint-stock company that cultivates it. The fact that last year we imported 5,027,074 hundredweight of sugar from Holland, Belgium, France, and Germany, is an instance of the deterrent effects of the present system. A large proportion, perhaps the whole, of this might have been produced profitably on our own soil; and the production of it here would, as the experience of the continent has demonstrated, have much increased the amount of corn and of meat that would then have been grown simultaneously on the area that yielded the sugar. But as it would not answer the purpose either of landlord or of tenant to spend £8,000 in erecting a sugar factory, our agriculture cannot be improved in this fashion; and we have, besides, as the unsatisfactory alternative, to pay our continental neighbours £6,963,938 for 5,027,074 hundredweights of sugar that we might have ourselves produced with considerable collateral advantages. And then, to look in the opposite direction, why cannot we have small holdings, producing for us the minor articles of consumption? For eggs alone we last year paid the foreigner not far from £2,500,000; and a great many more millions for poultry, butter, fruit, vegetables, and other such things, which large farmers, working on hired land with hired labour, cannot produce, but which are the natural produce of small holdings, cultivated by those who own them. Both costly scientific agriculture on a large scale, and the useful productions of the useful class of small proprietors, are rendered impossible for us by the accumulation of landed properties into large territories, through the action of our practice of settling and charging land. If this practice, which is entirely artificial and exceptional, were prohibited, then a clear

course would be opened both for the large and for the little culture—both for the scientific capitalist and for the labouring man.

In how many directions, then, do we find our present land system barring improvement and holding us back; or, still worse, working mischief amongst us! We have seen that it lessens the amount of useful and necessary commodities which the land of the country may be made to produce for the people of the country; that it obliges us to carry on our agriculture with a class of persons so circumstanced as to be incapable of appreciating rightly education, which is the great need of these times; that it necessitates a poor law, which, administered as it must be under existing conditions, is one of our chief sources of moral, of economical, and possibly of coming political mischief; that it prevents the people who do the manual labour, if not of all kinds, at all events of agriculture, from having homes; and that, as the acquisition or the improvement of a home is the natural, universal, proper object of saving, by destroying this motive, and superadding dependence on the poor law, it teaches unthrift, and all its attendant immoralities. We cannot suppose here, as we might in Switzerland and France, that every cottage we pass may be a school for the acquisition of the domestic virtues; and that by industry, and the practice of many forms of self-denial, a little hoard is being accumulated within it to meet all the adverse contingencies of life; and we have seen that it is our land system which has long been putting such homes as these, homes which do not breed drunken women and wife-kicking husbands, beyond our reach.

I will now, in as few words as possible, indicate two or three more evil fruits of the system, for it is instructive to see how widely and in what widely-differing directions the mischievous effects of a false system applied to land, which is the natural basis of society, ramify. It is because they are without property that we dread to give the franchise to a large section of the people. It is for the same reason that we cannot give military training to the whole people. Everybody notices the poverty and meanness of social life in our country towns: the reason of this is that the rent of any district does not contribute through those who own it to the enrichment and embellishment of the social life of its town. This, too, is the main cause of the difficulty, everywhere experienced in this country, of establishing good local middle schools. If the land were more largely divided, the difficulty would vanish, for then there would be on the spot a sufficient number of persons interested in the establishment and maintenance of such schools. The depopulation of our rural parishes, and the deterioration of the social condition of those whom our system maintains in them, constitute a great difficulty in the question of local government. There are many parishes in which not a man resident in the parish owns a rood of land in it, or even the house in which he lives. The system has made us the most homeless and

propertyless of all people. In such parishes there are not the materials for local government. The same fact will render disestablishment accompanied by disendowment, if it is to come, a far more difficult question economically at this day than it would have been seven hundred or a thousand years ago. At those dates there were a sufficient number of owners of property in each parish to build the parish churches; in these days, in many parishes there are not enough to keep the fabric in repair. I do not present the evils just indicated, together with those referred to in the course of this paper, as an exhaustive list of the charges that may be brought against our present land system: I shall, however, be satisfied, if what has been said be enough to dispose some of those who have hitherto not given much attention to these matters, to look a little into them. Here are several distinct evils. Like everything else in the world, they must have causes. Are their causes those I have suggested? If not, then what? Again, the times have certain acknowledged wants. If they cannot be supplied in the ways I have suggested, how are they to be supplied?

I have at times, in the preceding pages, been withheld by want of space from giving my reasons for the conclusions I had arrived at. Discussions, however, of some of the questions involved in them, should any one think it worth his while to make the reference, may be found dispersed throughout the three volumes I have lately published on Switzerland. In this article my aim is to set forth the fact that in our English Channel, within a few hours' steaming of our own shore, we have living under the English Crown a population more self-respecting, intelligent, enterprising, and generally well-to-do, than any equal number on an equal space anywhere else in the United Kingdom: my hope is that some of us may thereby be led to ask whether there is in the nature of things any prohibition against our becoming on our imperial scale what they are on their small island scale? My belief is that they could not have attained to their present position if they had had our land laws; and that, if land were distributed here as it is there, or still better perhaps if it were made absolutely free, that is absolutely the property of each generation both to sell and to devise as each proprietor at any moment pleased, no mischief of any kind would ensue; but that, on the contrary, as I have endeavoured to show, some grievous evils would be abated and some great advantages secured. I do not shrink from giving expression to this conclusion, because any one who is disposed to pursue these inquiries himself may, if he please, be on the day after he has read this article in the Channel Islands, seeing with his own eyes, and judging for himself how far the condition of their inhabitants has herein been rightly appreciated, and how far its evidence can be claimed in support of the views I have been maintaining.

F. B. ZINCKE.

THE THREE STAGES OF SHAKESPEARE.¹

THE example afforded by the *Comedy of Errors* would suffice to show that rhyme, however inadequate for tragic use, is by no means a bad instrument for romantic comedy. In another of Shakespeare's earliest works, which might almost be described as a 'lyrical farce, rhyme plays also a great part; but the finest passage, the real crown and flower of *Love's Labour's Lost*, is the praise or apology of love spoken by Biron in blank verse. This is worthy of Marlowe for dignity and sweetness, but has also the grace of a light and radiant fancy enamoured of itself, begotten between thought and mirth, a child-god with grave lips and laughing eyes, whose inspiration is nothing akin to Marlowe's. In this scene, as in the overture of the play and in its closing scene, but especially in the noble passage which winds up for a year the courtship of Biron and Rosaline, the spirit which informs the speech of the poet is finer of touch and deeper of tone than the sweetest of the serious interludes of the *Comedy of Errors*. The play is in the main a yet lighter thing, and more wayward and capricious in build, more formless and fantastic in plot, more incomposite altogether, than that first heir of Shakespeare's comic invention, which on its own ground is perfect in its consistency, blameless in composition and coherence; while in *Love's Labour's Lost* the fancy for the most part runs wild as the wind, and the structure of the story is as that of a house of clouds which the wind builds and unbuilds at pleasure. Here we find a very riot of rhymes, wild and wanton in their half-grown grace as a troop of "young satyrs, tender-hoofed and ruddy-horned;" during certain scenes we seem almost to stand again by the cradle of new-born comedy, and hear the first lisping and laughing accents run over from her baby lips in bubbling rhyme; but when the note changes we recognise the speech of gods. For the first time in our literature the higher key of poetic or romantic comedy is finely touched to a fine issue. The divine instrument fashioned by Marlowe for tragic purposes alone has found at once its sweet new use in the hands of Shakespeare. The way is prepared for *As You Like It* and the *Tempest*; the language is discovered which will suit the lips of Rosalind and Miranda.

What was highest as poetry in the *Comedy of Errors* was mainly in rhyme; all indeed, we might say, between the prelude spoken by Ægeon and the appearance in the last scene of his wife: in *Love's Labour's Lost* what was highest was couched wholly in blank

(1) Continued from the *Fortnightly Review* for May, 1875.

verse; in the *Two Gentlemen of Verona* rhyme has fallen seemingly into abeyance, and there are no passages of such elegiac beauty as in the former, of such exalted eloquence as in the latter of these plays; there is an even sweetness, a simple equality of grace in thought and language which keeps the whole poem in tune, written as it is in a subdued key of unambitious harmony. In perfect unity and keeping the composition of this beautiful sketch may perhaps be said to mark a stage of advance, a new point of work attained, a faint but sensible change of manner, signalised by increased firmness of hand and clearness of outline. Slight and swift in execution as it is, few and simple as are the chorals here struck of character and emotion, every shade of drawing and every note of sound is at one with the whole scheme of form and music. Here too is the first dawn of that higher and more tender humour which was never given in such perfection to any man as ultimately to Shakespeare; one touch of the by-play of Launce and his immortal dog is worth all the bright fantastic interludes of Boyet and Adriano, Costard and Holofernes; worth even half the sallies of Mercutio, and half the dancing doggerel or broad-witted prose of either Dromio. But in the final poem which concludes and crowns the first epoch of Shakespeare's work, the special graces and peculiar glories of each that went before are gathered together as in one garland "of every hue and every scent." The young genius of the master of all poets finds its consummation in the *Midsummer Night's Dream*. The blank verse is as full, sweet, and strong as the best of Biron's or Romeo's; the rhymed verse as clear, pure, and true as the simplest and truest melody of *Venus and Adonis* or the *Comedy of Errors*. But here each kind of excellence is equal throughout; there are here no purple patches on a gown of serge, but one seamless and imperial robe of a single dye. Of the lyric and the prosaic part, the counterchange of loves and laughter, of fancy fine as air and imagination high as heaven, what need can there be for any one to shame himself by the helpless attempt to say some word not utterly unworthy? Let it suffice to accept this poem as the landmark of our first stage, and pause to look back from it on what lies behind us of partial or of perfect work.

The highest point attained in this first period lies in the domain of comedy or romance, and belongs as much to lyric as to dramatic poetry; its sovereign quality is that of sweetness and springtide of fairy fancy crossed with light laughter and light trouble that end in perfect music. In history as in tragedy the master's hand is not yet come to its full strength and skill; its touch is not yet wholly assured, its work not yet wholly blameless. Besides the plays undoubtedly and entirely due to the still growing genius of Shakespeare, we have taken note but of two among those which bear the partial imprint of his hand. The long-vexed question as to the

authorship of the latter parts of *King Henry VI.*, in their earlier or later form, has not been touched upon; nor do I design to reopen that perpetual source of debate unstanchnable and inexhaustible dispute by any length of scrutiny or inquisition of detail. Two points must of course be taken for granted: that Marlowe was more or less concerned in the production, and Shakespeare in the revision, of these plays; whether before or after his additions to the original First Part of *King Henry VI.* we cannot determine, though the absence of rhyme might seem to indicate a later date for the recast of the *Contention*. But it is noticeable that the style of Marlowe appears more vividly and distinctly in passages of the reformed than of the unreformed plays. Those famous lines, for example, which open the fourth act of the Second Part of *King Henry VI.*, are not to be found in the corresponding scene of the First Part of the *Contention*; yet, whether they belong to the original sketch of the play, or were inserted as an afterthought into the revised and expanded copy, the authorship of these verses is surely unmisakeable:—

“The gaudy, blabbing, and remorseful day
Is crept into the bosom of the sea;
And now loud howling wolves arouse the jades
That drag the tragic melancholy night,” etc.

Aut Christophorus Marlowe, aut diabolus; it is inconceivable that any imitator but one should have had the power so to catch the very trick of his hand, the very note of his voice, and incredible that the one who might would have set himself to do so: for if this be not indeed the voice and this the hand of Marlowe, then what we find in these verses is not the fidelity of a follower, but the servility of a copyist. No parasitic rhymester of past or present days who feeds his starveling talent on the shreds and orts, “the fragments, scraps, the bits and greasy relics” of another man’s board, ever uttered a more parrot-like note of plagiary. The very exactitude of the repetition is a strong argument against the theory which attributes it to Shakespeare. That he had much at starting to learn of Marlowe, and that he did learn much—that in his earliest plays, and above all in his earliest historic plays, the influence of the elder poet, the echo of his style, the iteration of his manner, may perpetually be traced—I have already shown that I should be the last to question; but so exact an echo, so servile an iteration as this, I believe we shall nowhere find in them. The sonorous accumulation of emphatic epithets—as in the magnificent first verse of this passage—is indeed at least as much a note of the young Shakespeare’s style as of his master’s; but even were this one verse less in the manner of the elder than the younger poet—and this we can hardly say that it is—no single verse detached from its context can weigh a feather against the full and

flawless evidence of the whole speech. And of all this there is nothing in the *Contention*; the scene there opens in bald and flat nakedness of prose, striking at once into the immediate matter of stage business without the decoration of a passing epithet or a single trope.

From this sample it might seem that the main difficulty must be to detect anywhere the sign-manual of Shakespeare, even in the best passages of the revised play. On the other hand, it has not unreasonably been maintained that even in the next scene of this same act in its original form, and in all those following which treat of Cade's insurrection, there is evidence of such qualities as can hardly be ascribed to any hand then known but Shakespeare's. The forcible realism, the simple vigour and lifelike humour of these scenes, cannot, it is urged, be due to any other so early at work in the field of comedy. A critic desirous to press this point might further insist on the likeness or identity of tone between these and all later scenes in which Shakespeare has taken on him to paint the action and passion of an insurgent populace. With him, it might too plausibly be argued, the people once risen in revolt for any just or unjust cause is always the mob, the unwashed rabble, the swifish multitude; full as he is of wise and gracious tenderness for individual character, of swift and ardent pity for personal suffering, he has no deeper or finer feeling than scorn for "the beast with many heads" that fawn and butt at bidding as they are swayed by the vain and violent breath of any worthless herdsman. For the drovers who guide and misguide at will the turbulent flocks of their mutinous cattle his store of bitter words is inexhaustible; it is a treasure-house of obloquy which can never be drained dry. All this, or nearly all this, we must admit; but it brings us no nearer to any but a floating and conjectural kind of solution. In the earliest form known to us of this play it should seem that we have traces of Shakespeare's handiwork, in the latest that we find evidence of Marlowe's. But it would be something too extravagant for the veriest wind-sucker among commentators to start a theory that a revision was made of his original work by Marlowe after additions had been made to it by Shakespeare; yet we have seen that the most unmistakeable signs of Marlowe's handiwork, the passages which show most plainly the personal and present seal of his genius, belong to the play only in its revised form; while there is no part of the whole composition which can so confidently be assigned to Shakespeare as to the one man then capable of such work, as can an entire and important episode of the play in its unrevised state. Now the proposition that Shakespeare was the sole author of both plays in their earliest extant shape is refuted at once, and equally from without and from

within, by evidence of tradition and by evidence of style. There is therefore proof irresistible and unmistakeable of at least a double authorship; and the one reasonable conclusion left to us would seem to be this; that the first edition we possess of these plays is a partial transcript of the text as it stood after the first additions had been made by Shakespeare to the original work of Marlowe and others; for that this original was the work of more hands than one, and hands of notably unequal power, we have again the united witness of traditional and internal evidence to warrant our belief: and that among the omissions of this imperfect text were certain passages of the original work, which were ultimately restored in the final revision of the entire poem as it now stands among the collected works of Shakespeare.

No competent critic who has given due study to the genius of Marlowe will admit that there is a single passage of tragic or poetic interest in either form of the text, which is beyond the reach of the father of English tragedy: or, if there be one seeming exception in the expanded and transfigured version of Clifford's monologue over his father's corpse, which is certainly more in Shakespeare's tragic manner than in Marlowe's, and in the style of a later period than that in which he was on the whole apparently content to reproduce or to emulate the tragic manner of Marlowe, there is at least but this one exception to the general absolute truth of the rule; and even this great tragic passage is rather out of the range of Marlowe's style than beyond the scope of his genius. In the later as in the earlier version of these plays, the one manifest excellence of which we have no reason to suppose him capable is manifest in the comic or prosaic sense alone. The first great rapid sketch of the dying cardinal, afterwards so nobly enlarged and perfected on revision by the same or by a second artist, is as clearly within the capacity of Marlowe as of Shakespeare; and in either edition of the latter play, successively known as *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York*, as the *Second Part of the Contention*, and as the *Third Part of King Henry VI.*, the dominant figure which darkens all the close of the poem with the presage of a direr day is drawn by the same strong hand in the same tragic outline. From the first to the last stage of the work there is no mark of change or progress here; the whole play indeed has undergone less revision, as it certainly needed less, than the preceding part of the *Contention*. Those great verses which resume the whole spirit of Shakespeare's Richard—finer perhaps in themselves than any passage of the play which bears his name—are well-nigh identical in either form of the poem; but the reviser, with admirable judgment, has struck out, whether from his own text or that of another, the line which precedes them in the original sketch, where the passage runs thus:—

"I had no father, I am like no father ;
 I have no brothers, I am like no brothers ;"

(this reiteration is exactly in the first manner of our tragic drama ;)

"And this word love, which greybeards term divine," etc.

It would be an impertinence to transcribe the rest of a passage which rings in the ear of every reader's memory ; but it may be noted that the erasure by which its effect is so singularly heightened with the inborn skill of so divine an instinct is just such an alteration as would be equally likely to occur to the original writer on glancing over his printed text, as to a poet of kindred power, who, while busied in retouching and filling out the sketch of his predecessor, might be struck by the opening for so great an improvement at so small a cost of suppression. My own conjecture would incline to the belief that we have here a perfect example of the manner in which Shakespeare may be presumed, when such a task was set before him, to have dealt with the text of Marlowe. That at the outset of his career he was so employed, as well as on the texts of lesser poets, we have on all hands as good evidence of every kind as can be desired ; proof on one side from the text of the revised plays, which are as certainly in part the work of his hand as they are in part the work of another ; and proof on the opposite side from the open and clamorous charge of his rivals, whose imputations can be made to bear no reasonable meaning but this by the most violent ingenuity of perversion, and who presumably were not persons of such frank imbecility, such innocent and infantine malevolence, as to forge against their most dangerous enemy the pointless and edgeless weapon of a charge which, if ungrounded, must have been easier to refute than to devise. Assuming then that in common with other young poets of his day he was thus engaged during the first years of his connection with the stage, we should naturally have expected to find him handling the text of Marlowe with more of reverence and less of freedom than that of meaner men : ready, as in the *Contention*, to clear away with no timid hand their weaker and more inefficient work, to cancel and supplant it by worthier matter of his own ; but when occupied in recasting the verse of Marlowe, not less ready to confine his labour to such slight and skilful strokes of art as that which has led us into this byway of speculation : to the correction of a false note, the addition of a finer touch, the perfection of a meaning half expressed or a tone of half-uttered music : to the invigoration of sense and metre by substitution of the right word for the wrong, of a fuller phrase for one feebler : to the excision of such archaic and superfluous repetitions as are signs of a cruder stage of workmanship, relics of a ruder period of style, survivals of the earliest form or habit of dramatic poetry. Such work as

this, however humble in our present eyes, which look before and after, would assuredly have been worthy of the workman and his task; an office no less fruitful of profit, and no more unbecoming the pupil hand of the future master, than the subordinate handiwork of the young Raffaele or Leonardo on the canvas of Verrocchio or Perugino.

Of the doubtful or spurious plays which have been with more or less show of reason ascribed to this first period of Shakespeare's art, I have here no more to say than that I purpose in the proper place to take account of the only two among them which bear the slightest trace of any possible touch of his hand. For these two there is not, as it happens, the least witness of tradition or outward likelihood which might warrant us in assigning them a place apart from the rest, and nearer the chance of reception into the rank that has been claimed for them; while those plays in whose favour there is some apparent evidence from without, such as the fact of early or even original attribution to the master's hand, are, with one possible exception, utterly beyond the pale of human consideration as at any stage whatever the conceivable work of Shakespeare.

II. The second period is that of perfection in comic and historic style. The final heights and depths of tragedy, with all its reach of thought and all its pulse of passion, are yet to be scaled and sounded; but to this stage belongs the special quality of faultless, joyous, facile command upon each faculty required of the presiding genius for service or for sport. It is in the middle period of his work that the language of Shakespeare is most limpid in its fullness, the style most pure, the thought most transparent through the close and luminous raiment of perfect expression. The conceits and crudities of the first stage are outgrown and cast aside; the harshness and obscurity which at times may strike us as among the notes of his third manner have as yet no place in the flawless work of this second stage. That which has to be said is not yet too great for perfection of utterance; passion has not yet grappled with thought in so close and fierce an embrace as to strain and rend the garment of words, though stronger and subtler than ever was woven of human speech. Neither in his first nor in his last stage would the style of Shakespeare, even were it possible by study to reproduce it, be of itself a perfect and blameless model; but his middle style, that in which the typical plays of his second period are written, would be, if it were possible to imitate, the most absolute pattern that could be set before man. I do not speak of mere copyist's work, the parasitic knack of retailing cast phrases, tricks and forms of accent, cadences and catchwords proper only to the natural manner of the man who first came by instinct upon them, and by instinct put them

to use; I speak of that faithful and fruitful discipleship of love with which the highest among poets and the most original among workmen have naturally been always the first to study and the most earnest to follow the footsteps of the greatest among their kind. And this only high and profitable form of study and discipleship can set before itself, even in the work of Shakespeare, no pattern so perfect, no model so absolute, as is afforded by the style or manner of his second period.

To this stage belong by spiritual right if not by material, by rule of poetic order if not by date of actual succession, the greatest of his English histories and four of his greatest and most perfect comedies; the four greatest we might properly call them, reserving for another class the last divine triad of romantic plays which it is alike inaccurate to number among tragedies or comedies proper: the *Winter's Tale*, *Cymbeline*, and the *Tempest*, which belong of course wholly to his last manner, or, if accuracy must be strained even to pedantry, to the second manner of his third or final stage. A single masterpiece which may be classed either among histories or tragedies belongs to the middle period; and to this also we must refer, if not the ultimate form, yet assuredly the first sketch at least of that which is commonly regarded as the typical and supreme work of Shakespeare. Three lesser comedies, one of them in great part the recast or rather the transfiguration of an earlier poet's work, complete the list of plays assignable to the second epoch of his genius.

The ripest fruit of historic or national drama, the consummation and the crown of Shakespeare's labours in that line, must of course be recognised and saluted by all students in the supreme and sovereign trilogy of *Henry IV.* and *Henry V.* On a lower degree only than this final and imperial work we find the two chronicle histories which remain to be classed. In style as in structure they bear witness of a power less perfect, a less impeccable hand. They have less of perceptible instinct, less of vivid and vigorous utterance; the breath of their inspiration is less continuous and less direct, the fashion of their eloquence is more deliberate and more prepen-
 se; there is more of study and structure apparent in their speech, and less in their general scheme of action. Of all Shakespeare's plays they are the most rhetorical; there is more talk than song in them, less poetry than oratory; more finish than form, less movement than incident. Scene is laid upon scene, and event succeeds event, as stone might be laid on stone and story might succeed story in a building reared by mere might of human handiwork; not as in a city or temple whose walls had risen of themselves to the lyric breath and stroke of a greater than Amphion; moulded out of music by no rule or line of mortal measure, with no sound of

axe or anvil, but only of smitten strings; built by harp and not by hand.

The lordly structure of these poems is the work of a royal workman, full of masterdom and might, sublime in the state and strength of its many mansions, but less perfect in proportion and less ærial in build than the very highest fabrics fashioned after his own great will by the supreme architect of song. Of these plays, and of these alone among the maturer works of Shakespeare, it may be said that the best parts are discernible from the rest, divisible by analysis and separable by memory from the scenes which precede them or follow and the characters which surround them or succeed. Constance and Katherine rise up into remembrance apart from their environment and above it, stand clear in our minds of the crowded company with which the poet has begirt their central figures. In all other of his great tragic works, even in *Hamlet*, if we have grace and sense to read it aright and not awry, it is not of any single person or separate passage that we think when we speak of it; it is to the whole masterpiece that the mind turns at mention of its name. The one entire and perfect chrysolite of *Othello* is neither Othello nor Desdemona nor Iago, but each and all; the play of *Hamlet* is more than Hamlet himself, the poem even here is too great to be resumed in the person. 'But Constance is the jewel of *King John*, and Katherine the crowning blossom of *King Henry VIII.*—a funeral flower as of "marigolds on death-beds blowing," an opal of as pure water as "tears of perfect moan," with fitful fire at its heart, ominous of evil and sorrow, set in a mourning band of jet on the forefront of the poem, that the brow so circled may, "like to a title-leaf, foretell the nature of a tragic volume." Not indeed that without these the ground would in either case be barren; but that in either field our eye rests rather on these and other separate ears of wheat that overtop the ranks, than on the waving width of the whole harvest at once. In the one play our memory turns next to the figures of Arthur and the Bastard, in the other to those of Wolsey and his king: the residue in either case is made up of outlines more lightly and slightly drawn. In two scenes the figure of King John rises indeed to the highest height even of Shakespearian tragedy; for the rest of the play the lines of his character are cut no deeper, the features of his personality stand out in no sharper relief, than those of Eleanor or the French king; but the scene in which he tempts Hubert to the edge of the pit of hell sounds a deeper note and touches a subtler string in the tragic nature of man than had been struck by any poet save Dante alone, since the reign of the Greek tragedians. The cunning and profound simplicity of the few last weighty words which drop like flakes of poison that blister where they fall from the deadly lips of the king is a new quality in our tragic verse; there was no foretaste,

of such a thing in the passionate imagination which clothed itself in the mighty music of Marlowe's burning song. The elder master might indeed have written the magnificent speech which ushers in with gradual rhetoric and splendid reticence the black suggestion of a deed without a name; his hand might have woven with no less imperial skill the elaborate raiment of words and images which wraps up in fold upon fold, as with swaddling-bands of purple and golden embroidery, the shapeless and miscreated birth of a murderous purpose that labours into light even while it loathes the light and itself; but Shakespeare alone has given us the first sample of that more secret and terrible knowledge which reveals itself in the brief heavy whispers that seal the commission and sign the warrant of the king. Webster alone of all our tragic poets has had strength to emulate in this darkest line of art the handiwork of his master. We find nowhere such an echo or reflection of the spirit of this scene as in the last tremendous dialogue of Bosola with Ferdinand in the house of murder and madness, while their spotted souls yet flutter between conscience and distraction, hovering for an hour as with broken wings on the confines of either province of hell. One pupil at least could put to this awful profit the study of so great a model; but, with the single and sublime exception of that other design from the same great hand, which bares before us the mortal anguish of Bracciano, no copy or imitation of the scene in which John dies by poison has ever come near enough to evade the sentence it provokes. The shrill tremulous agony of Fletcher's Valentinian is to the sullen and slow death-pangs of Shakespeare's tyrant as the babble of a suckling to the accents of a man. As far beyond the reach of any but his maker's hand is the pattern of a perfect English warrior, set once for all before the eyes of all ages in the figure of the noble Bastard. The national side of Shakespeare's genius, the heroic vein of patriotism that runs like a thread of living fire through the world-wide range of his omnipresent spirit, has never, to my thinking, found vent or expression to such glorious purpose as here. Not even in Hotspur or Prince Hal has he mixed with more godlike sleight of hand all the lighter and graver good qualities of the national character, or compounded of them all so lovable a nature as this. In those others we admire and enjoy the same bright fiery temper of soul, the same buoyant and fearless mastery of fate or fortune, the same gladness and glory of life made lovely with all the labour and laughter of its full fresh days; but no quality of theirs binds our hearts to them as they are bound to Philip—not by his loyal valour, his keen young wit, his kindness, constancy, readiness of service, as swift and sure in the day of his master's bitterest shame and shame-fullest trouble as in the blithest hour of battle and that first good fight which won back his father's spoils from his father's slayer; but

more than all these, for that lightning of divine rage and pity, of tenderness that speaks in thunder and indignation that makes fire of its tears, in the horror of great compassion which falls on him, the tempest and storm of a beautiful and godlike anger which shakes his strength of spirit and bows his high heart down at sight of Arthur dead. Being thus, as he is, the English masterwork of Shakespeare's hand, we may well accept him as the best man known to us that England ever made; the hero that Nelson must have been had he never come too near Naples.

I am not minded to say much of Shakespeare's Arthur; there are one or two figures in the world of his work of which there are no words that would be fit or good to say. Another of these is Cordelia. The place they have in our lives and thoughts is not one for talk; the niche set apart for them to inhabit in our secret hearts is not penetrable by the lights and noises of common day. There are chapels in the cathedral of man's highest art as in that of his inmost life, not made to be set open to the eyes and feet of the world. Love and death and memory keep charge for us in silence of some beloved names. It is the crowning glory of genius, the final miracle and transcendent gift of poetry, that it can add to the number of these and engrave on the very heart of our remembrance fresh names and memories of its own creation.

There is one younger child in this heavenly family of Shakespeare's who sits side by side with Arthur in the secret places of our thought; there are but two or three that I remember among the children of other poets who may be named in the same year with them: as Fletcher's Hengo, Webster's Giovanni, and Landor's Casarion. Of this princely trinity of boys the "bud of Britain" is as yet the most famous flower; yet even in the broken words of childish heroism that flutter on his dying lips there is nothing of more poignant pathos, more "dearly sweet and bitter," than Giovanni's talk of his dead mother and all her sleepless nights now ended for ever in a sleep beyond tears or dreams. Perhaps the most nearly faultless in finish and proportion of perfect nature among all the noble three is Landor's portrait of the imperial and right Roman child of Cæsar and Cleopatra. I know not but this may be found in the judgment of men to come wellnigh the most pathetic and heroic figure bequeathed us after more than eighty years of a glorious life by the indomitable genius of our own last Roman and republican poet.

We have come now to that point at the opening of the second stage in his work where the supreme genius of all time begins first to meddle with the mysteries and varieties of human character, to handle its finer and more subtle qualities, to harmonize its more untuned and jarring discords; giving here and thus the first proof of a power never shared in like measure by the mightiest among the

sons of men, a sovereign and serene capacity to fathom the else unfathomable depths of spiritual nature, to solve its else insoluble riddles, to reconcile its else irreconcilable discrepancies. In his first stage Shakespeare had dropped his plummet no deeper into the sea of the spirit of man than Marlowe had sounded before him; and in the channel of simple emotion no poet could cast surer line with steadier hand than he. Further down in the dark and fiery depths of human pain and mortal passion no soul could search than his who first rendered into speech the aspirations and the agonies of a ruined and revolted spirit. And until Shakespeare found in himself the strength of eyesight to read and the cunning of handiwork to render those wider diversities of emotion and those further complexities of character which lay outside the range of Marlowe, he certainly cannot be said to have outrun the winged feet, outstripped the fiery flight of his forerunner. In the heaven of our tragic song the first-born star on the forehead of its herald god was not outshone till the full midsummer meridian of that greater godhead before whom he was sent to prepare a pathway for the sun. Through all the forenoon of our triumphant day, till the utter consummation and ultimate ascension of dramatic poetry incarnate and transfigured in the master-singer of the world, the quality of his tragedy was as that of Marlowe's, broad, single, and intense; large of hand, voluble of tongue, direct of purpose. With the dawn of its second epoch a new power comes upon it, to find clothing and expression in new forms of speech and after a new style. The language has put off its foreign decorations of lyric and elegiac ornament; it has found already its infinite gain in the loss of those sweet superfluous graces which encumbered the march and enchained the utterance of its childhood. The figures which it invests are now no more the types of a single passion, the incarnations of a single thought. They now demand a scrutiny which tests the power of a mind and tries the value of a judgment; they appeal to something more than the instant apprehension which sufficed to respond to the immediate claim of those that went before them. Romeo and Juliet were simply lovers, and their names bring back to us no further thought than of their love and the lovely sorrow of its end; Antony and Cleopatra shall be before all things lovers, but the thought of their love and its triumphant tragedy shall recall other things beyond number—all the forces and all the fortunes of mankind, all the chance and all the consequence that waited on their imperial passion, all the infinite variety of qualities and powers wrought together and welded into the frame and composition of that love which shook from end to end all nations and kingdoms of the earth.

The same truth holds good in lighter matters; Biron and Rosaline in comedy are as simply lovers and no more as were their

counterparts and coevals in tragedy; there is more in Benedick and Beatrice than this simple quality of love that clothes itself in the strife of wits; the injury done her cousin, which by the repercussion of its shock and refraction of its effect serves to transfigure with such adorable indignation and ardour of furious love and pity the whole bright light nature of Beatrice, serves likewise by a fresh reflection and countercharge of its consequence to exalt and enlarge the stature of her lover's spirit after a fashion beyond the reach of Shakespeare in his first stage. Mercutio again, like Philip, is a good friend and gallant swordsman, quick-witted and hot-blooded, of a fiery and faithful temper, loyal and light and swift alike of speech and swordstroke; and this is all. But the character of the Bastard, clear and simple as broad sunlight though it be, has in it other features than this single and beautiful likeness of frank young manhood; his love of country and loathing of the Church that would bring it into subjection are two sides of the same national quality that has made and will always make every Englishman of his type such another as he was in belief and in unbelief, patriot and priest-hater; and no part of the design bears such witness to the full-grown perfection of his creator's power and skill as the touch that combines and fuses into absolute unity of concord the high and various elements of faith in England, loyalty to the wretched lord who has made him knight and acknowledged him kinsman, contempt for his abjection at the foul feet of the Church, abhorrence of his crime and constancy to his cause for something better worth the proof of war than his miserable sake who hardly can be roused, even by such exhortation as might put life and spirit into the dust of dead men's bones, to bid his betters stand and strike in defence of the country dishonoured by his reign.

It is this new element of variety in unity, this study of the complex and diverse shades in a single nature, which requires from any criticism worth attention some inquisition of character as complement to the investigation of style. Analysis of any sort would be inapplicable to the actors who bear their parts in the comic, the tragic or historic plays of the first period. There is nothing in them to analyse; they are, as we have seen, like all the characters represented by Marlowe, the embodiments or the exponents of single qualities and simple forces. The question of style also is therefore so far a simple question; but with the change and advance in thought and all matter of spiritual study and speculation this question also becomes complex, and inseparable, if we would pursue it to any good end, from the analysis of character and subject. In the debate on which we are now to enter, the question of style and the question of character, or as we might say the questions of matter and of spirit, are more than ever indivisible from each other,

more inextricably inwoven than elsewhere into the one most difficult question of authorship which has ever been disputed in the dense and noisy school or fought out in the wide and windy field of Shakespearian controversy.

There can be few serious students of Shakespeare who have not felt that the hardest problem involved in their study is that which requires for its solution some reasonable and acceptable theory as to the play of *Henry VIII.* None such has ever yet been offered; and I certainly cannot pretend to supply one. Perhaps however it may be possible to do some service by an attempt to disprove what is untenable, even though it should not be possible to produce in its stead any positive proof of what we may receive as matter of absolute faith.

The veriest tiro in criticism who knows anything of the subject in hand must perceive, what is certainly not beyond a schoolboy's range of vision, that the metre and the language of this play are in great part so like the language and the metre of Fletcher that the first and easiest inference would be to assume the partnership of that poet in the work. In former days it was Jonson whom the critics and commentators of their time saw good to select as the colleague or editor of Shakespeare; but a later school of criticism has resigned the notion that the fifth act was retouched and adjusted by the author of *Volpone* to the taste of his patron James. The later theory is more plausible than this; the objection to it is simply that it is too facile and superficial. It is waste of time to point out what any intelligent and imaginative child with a tolerable ear for metre who had read a little of the one and the other poet could see for himself—that much of the play is externally as like the usual style of Fletcher as it is unlike the usual style of Shakespeare. The question is whether we can find one scene, one speech, one passage, which in spirit, in scope, in purpose, bears the same or any comparable resemblance to the work of Fletcher. I doubt if any man more warmly admires a poet whom few can have studied more thoroughly than I; to whom, in spite of all sins of omission and commission—and many and grievous they are, beyond the plenary absolution of even the most indulgent among critical confessors—I constantly return with a fresh sense of attraction, which is constantly rewarded by a fresh sense of gratitude and delight. It is assuredly from no wish to pluck a leaf from his laurel, which has no need of foreign grafts or stolen garlands from the loftier growth of Shakespeare's, that I venture to question his capacity for the work assigned to him by recent criticism. The speech of Buckingham, for example, on his way to execution, is of course at first sight very like the finest speeches of the kind in Fletcher; here is the same smooth and fluent declamation, the same prolonged and persistent melody, which

if not monotonous is certainly not various ; the same pure, lucid, perspicuous flow of simple rather than strong and elegant rather than exquisite English ; and yet, if we set it against the best examples of the kind which may be selected from such tragedies as *Bonduca* or *The False One*, against the rebuke addressed by Caratach to his cousin or by Cæsar to the murderers of Pompey—and no finer instances of tragic declamation can be chosen from the work of this great master of rhetorical dignity and pathos—I cannot but think we shall perceive in it a comparative severity and elevation which will be missed when we turn back from it to the text of Fletcher. There is an aptness of phrase, an abstinence from excess, a “plentiful lack” of mere flowery and superfluous beauties, which we may rather wish than hope to find in the most famous of Shakespeare’s successors. But if not his work, we may be sure it was his model ; a model which he often approached, which he often studied, but which he never attained. It is never for absolute truth and fitness of expression, it is always for eloquence and sweetness, for fluency and fancy, that we find the tragic scenes of Fletcher most praiseworthy ; and the motive or mainspring of interest is usually anything but natural or simple. Now the motive here is as simple, the emotion as natural as possible ; the author is content to dispense with all the violent or far-fetched or fantastic excitement from which Fletcher could hardly ever bring himself completely to abstain. I am not speaking here of those tragedies in which the hand of Beaumont is traceable ; to those, I need hardly say, the charge is comparatively inapplicable which may fairly be brought against the unassisted works of his elder colleague ; but in any of the typical tragedies of Fletcher, in *Thierry and Theodoret*, in *Valentinian*, in *The Double Marriage*, the scenes which for power and beauty of style may reasonably be compared with this of the execution of Buckingham will be found more forced in situation, more fanciful in language than this. Many will be found more beautiful, many more exciting ; the famous interview of Thierry with the veiled Ordella, and the scene answering to this in the fifth act where Brunhilt is confronted with her dying son, will be at once remembered by all dramatic students ; and the parts of Lucina and Juliana may each be described as a continuous arrangement of passionate and pathetic effects. But in which of these parts and in which of these plays shall we find a scene so simple, an effect so modest, a situation so unforced as here ? where may we look for the same temperance of tone, the same control of excitement, the same steadiness of purpose ? If indeed Fletcher could have written this scene, or the farewell of Wolsey to his greatness, or his parting scene with Cromwell, he was perhaps not a greater poet, but he certainly was a tragic writer capable of

loftier self-control and severer self-command, than he has ever shown himself elsewhere.

And yet, if this were all, we might be content to believe that the dignity of the subject and the high example of his present associate had for once lifted the natural genius of Fletcher above itself. But the fine and subtle criticism of Mr. Spedding, first printed now some twenty-five years since, has in the main, I think, successfully and clearly indicated the lines of demarcation undeniably discernible in this strange and inconsequent poem between the severer style of certain scenes, or speeches and the laxer and more fluid style of others; between the graver, solidier, more condensed parts of the composite work, and those which are clearer, thinner, more diffused and diluted in expression. If under the latter head we had to class such passages only as the dying speech of Buckingham and the christening speech of Cranmer, it might be almost impossible to resist the internal evidence of Fletcher's handiwork. Certainly we hear the same soft continuous note of fluent eloquence, smooth and limpid as a stream of crystalline transparency, in the plaintive adieu of the condemned statesman and the panegyrical prophecy of the favoured prelate. If this, I say, were all, we might admit that there is nothing—I have already admitted it—in either passage beyond the poetic reach of Fletcher: But on the hypothesis so ably maintained by the editor of Bacon there hangs no less a consequence than this: that we must assign to the same hand the crowning glory of the whole poem, the death-scene of Katherine. Now if Fletcher could have written that scene—a scene on which the only criticism ever passed, the only commendation ever bestowed, by the verdict of successive centuries, has been that of tears and silence—if Fletcher could have written a scene so far beyond our applause, so far above our acclamation, then the memory of no great poet has ever been so grossly wronged, so shamefully defrauded of its highest claim to honour. But, with all reverence for that memory, I must confess that I cannot bring myself to believe it. Any explanation appears, to me more probable than this. Considering with what care every relic of his work was once and again collected by his posthumous editors—even to the attribution, not merely of plays in which he can have taken only the slightest part, but of plays in which we know that he had no share at all—I cannot believe that his friends would have let by far the brightest jewel in his crown rest unclaimed in the then less popular treasure-house of Shakespeare. Belief or disbelief of this kind is however but a sandy soil for conjecture to build upon. Whether or not his friends would have reclaimed for him the credit of this scene, had they known it (as they must have known it) to be his due, I must repeat that such a miraculous example of a man's genius for once trans-

ceding itself and for ever eclipsing all its other achievements appears to me beyond all critical, beyond all theological credulity. Pathos and concentration are surely not among the dominant notes of Fletcher's style or the salient qualities of his intellect. Except perhaps in the beautiful and famous passage where Hengo dies in his uncle's arms, I doubt whether in any of the variously and highly coloured scenes played out upon the wide and shifting stage of his fancy the genius of Fletcher has ever unlocked the source of tears. Bellario and Aspatia were the children of his younger colleague; at least, after the death of Beaumont we meet no such figures on the stage of Fletcher. In effect, though Beaumont had a gift of grave sardonic humour which found especial vent in burlesques of the heroic style and in the systematic extravagance of such characters as Bessus,¹ yet he was above all things a tragic poet; and though Fletcher had great power of tragic eloquence and passionate effusion, yet his comic genius was of a rarer and more precious quality; one *Spanish Curate* is worth many a *Valentinian*; as, on the other hand, one *Philaster* is worth many a *Scornful Lady*. Now there is no question here of Beaumont; and there is no question that the passage here debated has been taken to the heart of the whole world and baptized in the tears of generations as no work of Fletcher's has ever been. That Beaumont could have written it I do not believe; but I am wellnigh assured that Fletcher could not. I can scarcely imagine that the most fluid sympathy, the most easily distilled from the eyes of reader or spectator, can ever have watered with its tears the scene or the page which sets forth, however eloquently and effectively, the sorrows and heroisms of Ordella, Juliana, or Lucina. Every success but this I can well believe them, as they assuredly deserve, to have attained.

To this point then we have come, as to the crucial point at issue; and looking back upon those passages of the play which first suggest the handiwork of Fletcher, and which certainly do now and then seem almost identical in style with his, I think we shall hardly find the difference between these and other parts of the same play so wide and so distinct as the difference between the undoubted work of Fletcher and the undoubted work of Shakespeare. What that difference is we are fortunately able to determine with exceptional certitude, and with no supplementary help from conjecture of proba-

(1) Compare with Beaumont's admirable farce of Bessus the wretched imitation of it attempted after his death in the *Nice Valour* of Fletcher; whose proper genius was neither for pure tragedy nor broad farce, but for high comedy and heroic romance—a field of his own invention; witness *Monsieur Thomas* and *The Knight of Malta*; while Beaumont has approved himself in tragedy all but the worthiest disciple of Shakespeare, in farce beyond all comparison the aptest pupil of Jonson. He could give us no *For or Alchemist*; but the inventor of Bessus and Calianax was worthy of the esteem and affection returned to him by the creator of *Morose* and *Rabbi Busy*.

bilities. In the play which is undoubtedly a joint work of these poets the points of contact and the points of disunion are unmistakable by the youngest eye. In the very last scene of the *Two Noble Kinsmen*, we can tell with absolute certainty what speeches were appended or interpolated by Fletcher; we can pronounce with positive conviction what passages were completed and what parts were left unfinished by Shakespeare. Even on Mr. Spedding's theory it can hardly be possible to do as much for *Henry VIII.* The lines of demarcation, however visible or plausible, are fainter by far than these. It is certainly not less strange to come upon such passages in the work of Shakespeare as the speeches of Buckingham and Crammer than it would be to encounter in the work of Sophocles a sample of the later and laxer style of Euripides; to meet for instance in the *Antigone* with a passage which might pass muster as an extract from the *Iphigenia in Aulis*. In metrical effects the style of the lesser English poet is an exact counterpart of the style of the lesser Greek; there is the same comparative tenuity and fluidity of verse, the same excess of short unemphatic syllables, the same solution of the graver iambic into soft overflow of lighter and longer feet which relaxes and dilutes the solid harmony of tragic metre with notes of a more facile and feminine strain. But in *Henry VIII.* it should be remarked that though we find the same preponderance as in Fletcher's work of verses with a double ending—which in English verse at least are not in themselves feminine, and need not to be taken to constitute, as in Fletcher's case they do, a note of comparative effeminacy or relaxation in tragic style—we do not find the triple terminations so peculiarly and notably dear to that poet; so that even by the test of the metre-mongers who would reduce the whole question at issue to a point which might at once be solved by the simple process of numeration the argument in favour of Fletcher can hardly be proved tenable; for the metre which evidently has one leading quality in common with his is as evidently wanting in another at least as marked and as necessary to establish—if established it can be by any such test taken singly and apart from all other points of evidence—the collaboration of Fletcher with Shakespeare in this instance. And if the proof by mere metrical similitude is thus imperfect, there is here assuredly no other kind of test which may help to fortify the argument by any suggestion of weight even comparable to this. In those passages which would serve most plausibly to indicate the probable partnership of Fletcher, the unity and sustained force of the style keep it generally above the average level of his; there is less admixture or intrusion of lyric or elegiac quality; there is more of temperance and proportion alike in declamation and in debate. And throughout the whole play, and under all the

diversity of composite subject and conflicting interest which disturbs the unity of action, there is a singleness of spirit, a general unity or concord of inner tone, in marked contrast to the utter discord and discrepancy of the several sections of the *Two Noble Kinsmen*. We admit, then, that this play offers us the single instance of a style not elsewhere traceable in Shakespeare; that no exact parallel to it can be found among his other plays; and that if not the partial work it may certainly be taken as the general model of Fletcher in his tragic poetry. On the other hand, we contend that its exceptional quality is explicable as a tentative essay in a new line by one who tried so many styles before settling into his latest; and that, without far stronger, clearer, and completer proof than has yet been or can ever be advanced, the question is not solved but merely evaded by the assumption of a double authorship.

By far the ablest argument based upon a wider ground of reason or of likelihood than this of mere metre that has yet been advanced in support of the theory which would attribute a part of this play to some weaker hand than Shakespeare's is due to the study of a critic whose name—already by right of inheritance the most illustrious name of his age and ours—is now for ever attached to that of Shakespeare himself by right of the highest service ever done and the noblest duty ever paid to his memory. The untimely death which removed beyond reach of our thanks for all he had done and our hopes for all he might do the man who first had given to France the first among foreign poets—son of the greatest Frenchman and translator of the greatest Englishman—was only in this not untimely, that it forbore him till the great and wonderful work was done which has bound two deathless names together by a closer than the common link that connects the names of all sovereign poets. Among all classic translations of the classic works of the world, I know of none that for absolute mastery and perfect triumph over all accumulation of obstacles, for supreme dominion over supreme difficulty, can be matched with the translation of Shakespeare by François-Victor Hugo, unless a claim of companionship may perchance be put in for Urquhart's version of Rabelais. For such success in the impossible as finally disproves the right of "that fool of a word" to existence—at least in the world of letters—the two miracles of study and of sympathy which have given Shakespeare to the French and Rabelais to the English, and each in his habit as he lived, may take rank together in glorious rivalry beyond eyeshot of all past or future competition.

Among the essays appended to the version of Shakespeare which they complete and illustrate, that which deals with the play now in question gives as ample proof as any other of the sound and subtle insight brought to bear by the translator upon the object of his labour and his love. His keen and studious intuition is here as

always not less notable and admirable than his large and solid knowledge, his full and lucid comprehension at once of the text and of the history of Shakespeare's plays; and if his research into the inner details of that history may seem ever to have erred from the strait path of firm and simple certainty into some dubious byway of theory or conjecture, we may be sure at least that no lack of learning or devotion, of ardour or intelligence, but more probably some noble thought that was fathered by a noble wish to do honour to Shakespeare, has led him to attribute to his original some quality foreign to the text, or to question the authenticity of what for love of his author he might not wish to find in it. Thus he would reject the main part of the fifth act as the work of a mere court laureate, an official hack or hireling employed to anoint the memory of an archbishop and lubricate the steps of a throne with the common oil of dramatic adulation; and finding it in either case a task unlike unworthy of Shakespeare to glorify the name of Cranmer or to deify the names of the queen then dead and the king yet living, it is but natural that he should be induced by an unconscious bias or prepossession of the will to depreciate the worth of the verse spent on work fitter for ushers and embalmers and the general valettry or varlettry of Church and State. That this fifth act is unequal in point of interest to the better part of the preceding acts with which it is connected by so light and loose a tie of convenience is as indisputable as that the style of the last scene savours more strongly than ever of Fletcher's most special and distinctive qualities, or that the whole structure of the play if judged by any strict rule of pure art is incomposite and incongruous, wanting in unity, consistency, and coherence of interest. The fact is that here even more than in *King John* the poet's hands were hampered by a difficulty inherent in the subject. To an English and Protestant audience, fresh from the passions and perils of reformation and reaction, he had to present an English king at war with the papacy, in whom the assertion of national independence was incarnate; and to the sympathies of such an audience it was a matter of mere necessity for him to commend the representative champion of their cause by all means which he could compel into the service of his aim. Yet this object was in both instances all but incompatible with the natural and necessary interest of the plot. It was inevitable that this interest should in the main be concentrated upon the victims of the personal or national policy of either king; upon Constance and Arthur, upon Katherine and Wolsey. Where these are not, either apparent in person on the stage, or felt in their influence upon the speech and action of the characters present, the pulse of the poem beats fainter and its forces begin to flag. In *King John* this difficulty was met and mastered, these double claims of the subject of the poem and the object of the poet were satisfied and harmonized, by the effacement of John and

the substitution of Philip as the champion of the national cause and the protagonist of the dramatic action. Considering this play in its double aspect of tragedy and history, we might say that the English hero becomes the central figure of the poem as seen from the historic side, while John remains the central figure of the poem as seen from the tragic side; the personal interest that depends on personal crime and retribution is concentrated on the agony of the king; the national interest which, though the eponymous hero of the poem, he was alike inadequate as a craven and improper as a villain to sustain and represent in the eyes of the spectators was happily and easily transferred to the one person of the play who could properly express within the compass of its closing act at once the protest against papal pretension, the defiance of foreign invasion, and the prophetic assurance of self-dependent life and self-sufficing strength inherent in the nation then fresh from a fiercer trial of its quality, which an audience of the days of Queen Elizabeth would justly expect from the poet who undertook to set before them in action the history of the days of King John. That history had lately been brought upon the stage under the hottest and most glaring light that could be thrown on it by the fire of fanatical partisanship; *The Troublesome Reign of King John*, weakest and most wooden of all wearisome chronicles that ever cumbered the boards, had in it for sole principle of life its power of congenial appeal to the same blatant and vulgar spirit of Protestantism which inspired it. In all the flat interminable morass of its tedious and traceless verse I can find no blade or leaf of living poetic growth, no touch but one of nature or of pathos, where Arthur dying would send a last thought in search of his mother. From this play Shakespeare can have got neither hint nor help towards the execution of his own; the crude rough sketch of the Bastard as he brawls and swaggers through the long length of its scenes is hardly so much as the cast husk or chrysalid of the noble creature which was to arise and take shape for ever at the transfiguring touch of Shakespeare. In the case of *King Henry VIII.* he had not even such a blockish model as this to work from. The one preceding play known to me which deals professedly with the same subject treats of quite other matters than are handled by Shakespeare, and most notably with the scholastic adventures or misadventures of Edward Prince of Wales and his whipping-boy Ned Browne. A fresh argument might be raised by the critics who deny the unity of authorship in *King Henry VIII.*, on the ground that if Shakespeare had completed the work himself he would surely not have let slip the occasion to introduce one of the most famous and popular of all court fools in the person of Will Summers; who might have given life and relief to the action of many scenes now unvaried and unbroken in their gravity of emotion and event.

Shakespeare, one would say, might naturally have been expected to take up and remodel the well-known figure of which his humble precursor could give but a rough thin outline, yet sufficient it should seem to attract the tastes to which it appealed; for this or some other quality of seasonable attraction served to float the now forgotten play of Rowley through several editions. The central figure of the huge hot-headed king, with his gusts of stormy good humour and peals of burly oaths which might have suited "Gargantua's mouth" and satisfied the requirements of Hotspur, appeals in a ruder fashion to the survival of the same sympathies on which Shakespeare with a finer instinct as evidently relied; the popular estimate of the bluff and brawny tyrant "who broke the bonds of Rome" was not yet that of later historians, though doubtless neither was it that of the writer or writers who would champion him to the utterance. Perhaps the opposite verdicts given by the instinct of the people on "bluff King Hal" and "Bloody Mary" may be understood by reference to a famous verse of Juvenal. The wretched queen was sparing of noble blood and lavish of poor men's lives—*cerdonibus timenda*; and the curses under which her memory was buried were spared by the people to her father, *Lamiarum cede madenti*. In any case, the humblest not less than the highest of the poets who wrote under the reign of his daughter found it safe to present him in a popular light before an audience of whose general prepossession in his favour William Shakespeare was no slower to take advantage than Samuel Rowley.

The two plays we have just discussed have one quality of style in common which has already been noted; that in them rhetoric is in excess of action or passion, and far in excess of poetry. They are not as yet perfect examples of his second manner, though far ahead of his first stage in performance as in promise. Compared with the full and living figure of Katherine or of Constance, the study of Margaret of Anjou is the mere sketch of a poet still in his pupillage: John and Henry, Philip and Wolsey, are designs beyond reach of the hand which drew the second and third Richard without much background or dramatic perspective. But the difficulties inherent in either subject are not surmounted throughout with absolute equality of success; the very point of appeal to the sympathy and excitement of the time may have been something of a disturbing force in the composition of the work—a loadstone rock indeed, of tempting attraction to the patriot as well as to the playwright, but possibly capable of proving in some measure a rock of offence to the poet whose ship was piloted towards it. His perfect triumph in the field of national drama, coincident with the perfect maturity of his comic genius and his general style, was yet to show itself as the crowning sign of his great second period.

A. C. SWINBURNE.

THE RELATIONS OF WESTERN POWERS WITH THE EAST.

WE were lately told, by the *Times*, that "Our concerns with the vast and still almost unknown empire of China, are of more real importance to the British Empire than Continental disputes about a province or a river. And every one acquainted with those regions is possessed by the conviction that there the next generation, if not the present, will witness one of the greatest revolutions of humanity." This last, as a speculative opinion on the future of Eastern Asia, is open to question, but the first is matter of demonstration.* The utterances of the journals on our relations with China, Burmah, and the Malay Peninsula, have recently been bewildering in their number, no less than in the variety of opinions conveyed. Two months ago there seemed to be a lull, and some hope of a breathing time being allowed, during which it might be possible to digest the mass of crude matter forced upon public attention. Sufficient at least to permit a deliberate judgment to be formed on the actual position of affairs in the Eastern World. Our minister at Peking had telegraphed to the Foreign Office that the terms of a settlement had been agreed upon, and that the English members of the commission of inquiry into the Yunnan outrage, were actually on their way. But scarcely had we congratulated ourselves on this apparent commencement of a peaceful settlement in China, than another series of telegrams followed each other in hot haste, announcing the murder of Mr. Birch, our Resident at Perak, and an outbreak in the Malay Peninsula. The unpleasant surprise occasioned by this intelligence, as unexpected as it was unwelcome, had not passed away, when the announcement of another and more pressing danger appeared. The "Eastern Question," we were assured, "was advancing, was indeed upon us," despite all efforts to stave off, to another and more convenient season, a final solution. The Turkish Government had declared itself bankrupt. The Egyptian finances were suspected to be in no better position, and Egyptian scrip went down 20 per cent. Lastly, there burst upon the political and financial world, the news that the British Government had bought the Khedive's shares in the Suez Canal for £4,000,000, and by that act, it was supposed, declared its determination to hold a material stake in Egypt, and secure at all costs the shortest line of communication with India and the Eastern seas. With this culminating news, the field of Eastern interests suddenly widened, and all Asia was seen in the distance, looming on the political horizon. It was no

longer the Eastern Question, in the restricted sense of Turkish repudiation, and provinces rising in revolt against misrule and oppression,—with a foreshadowing of foreign intervention and dismemberment, as the only practical solution. The future destiny of Constantinople, with what may remain of the Ottoman Empire in Europe, it is now seen, forms only one of a series of Eastern Questions, or rather several groups of such questions, more or less closely connected by continuous threads which run through the whole. Thus Turkey in Europe and Asia, and its future destiny, form one group, usually regarded as constituting the Eastern Question which chiefly affects Europe, and Russia and Austria more immediately. Persia and Egypt enter into a second great group comprising Central Asia, in which Great Britain, through its Indian empire, and Russia, alone among European Powers, are principals with national interests to defend. Beyond the Ganges, in Eastern Asia—the “*Far East*,” where the Chinese and Russian Empires run coterminous along a frontier of some three thousand miles from Kuldja in Turkestan, to Manchuria and the banks of the Amoor,—at the most eastern extremity, we have a third. How these three groups dovetail into and overlap each other, so that they can never be entirely separated, and yet hold a very distinct course, only here and there showing points of contact, is daily becoming more apparent. Russia in all three is a principal factor, and as a great European Power connects them inseparably. In South-Eastern Europe and Western Asia the Sublime Porte as suzerain is dominant, but Russia first, and Austria in second line, are the moving forces in any territorial or political transmutations in that region. Other Powers on the Mediterranean, and maritime states generally, have undoubtedly national interests engaged, which, if not so direct, are of great importance. All these, too, have some interests of varying magnitude with Central and Eastern Asia, and therefore Egypt, as the most direct line of communication becomes a connecting link, and the bridge over which all must pass to the Eastern seas. Hence the independence of Egypt and the stability of its government are matters of common interest, quite as much so perhaps, as the possession of Constantinople. Persia, as offering an alternative direct line of communication, occupies a similar position in connection with Europe and the relations of Western Powers with the East. Central Asia brings into the field the only two European states which are also great Asiatic powers—Russia and Great Britain. In Eastern Asia, Russia and China alone have territorial and political interests engaged. The other European powers have only those which are commercial. We shall see presently how Central Asia is closely linked and brought in connection with this third group of Eastern Questions to which the relations with the West give rise. These comprise

Japan, Korea, China, with all the outlying dominions in Mongolia and Tartary between Peking and Yarkand, in Eastern Turkestan, with Thibet and Nepaul, and the Burmese and Cochin China States, all either tributaries, or under the overshadowing influence of the great Empire on their borders. The claims of the Chinese on Eastern Turkestan make the link which chiefly connects them with Central Asia. By their hold on Thibet and Nepaul, China equally comes within the circle as affecting our Indian Empire; while in the south, our possessions in Burmah and the Malayan Peninsula constitute another link in the chain which brings Eastern and Central Asia into the same field. So it will be evident, that although there is a very broad line of demarcation between each of the three great divisions, there is the sort of overlapping and insensible merging of characteristic differences, which we observe in the three kingdoms of nature, the mineral, the vegetable, and the animal. They cannot be totally severed, nor can any distinct line be drawn where the one ceases to have anything common to the other, or is not subject to the same controlling laws and disturbing forces.

If this be true, and represent with sufficient accuracy the actual conditions under which the relations of Europe with Asia are carried on, and all intercourse between the Western and Eastern worlds must be conducted, whether the objects be more especially political, commercial, or religious, there will be an obvious advantage in treating of any one of the three groups, if we take care not to lose sight of the common threads which run through, and at different points of contact broaden out, to be interwoven with the texture of the whole. It is impossible, for instance, to deal in any comprehensive or satisfactory way with the questions more directly concerning the East of Europe and Western Asia, centring round the Bosphorus, if we do not keep in view the relations of Russia with Persia and Egypt. The Central Asian questions are in like manner inextricably interwoven at some points with the Turkish question, by reason of a community of religion and affinities of race, as well as contiguity of boundaries.

This religious element seems destined to play an important part in the wars which both the Chinese and Russians are engaged in prosecuting at the present moment, the one in Eastern Turkestan, and the other in the Khanates of Kiva and Bokhara, and along the banks of the Oxus and Jaxartes. These may light up a religious war and give rise to a revival of Islamism among the fanatic followers of the Prophet, from the borders of the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, to Yarkand and Delhi, as well as in the Malay Peninsula and adjoining Archipelago, and thus bring all the three groups of Asiatic and Eastern questions into line. We need not wonder, then, that in the Prime Minister's speech at the Lord Mayor's dinner, the

Chinese and the Ottoman Empires, with some references to our Indian interests, supplied all the materials for his remarks on foreign affairs, while our immediate neighbours, the Western States in Europe, were passed over in silence.

In a recent article in this Review¹ I desired to trace how the vast empire conquered by Genghis Khan in the thirteenth century had first been created, and then parcelled out and divided by his sons and grandsons, though still acknowledging in the head of the house a species of suzerainty. This *excursus* into Mongol history was not without a practical purpose. I wished to show that the division of territories which took place over this vast region—from the Amoor and the Yellow Sea at one extremity of Asia to the Mediterranean at the other, and far into Europe to the borders of Poland in the West—was not the result of mere accident, or caprice among the descendants of the great conqueror. There have been several such devastating inundations of Tartar and Mongol hordes both before and since the conquests of Genghis, which have equally covered the whole of Asia and Eastern Europe. But not the less, while leaving certain permanent deposits as the waters subsided, the same great landmarks and divisions have always reappeared, and may be traced in the territorial divisions of the present day. The inference from so remarkable a persistence, during some six centuries after the devastating course of Mongol invasions, is that those groupings or divisions of territories were not arbitrary, but the result of a certain natural fitness or tendency, by reason either of race, language, religion, or the physical conditions of the soil and climate. Some or all of these combining to produce like results, as often as previous settlements had been disturbed or swept away. If this be a right conclusion, we should not only be able to trace, in the present territorial distribution of tribes and nationalities, a somewhat similar division, but we may reasonably conclude that in the future the same tendency will continue, whatever changes may be provisionally effected by the sword. Of course such inferences and parallels must not be pushed too far. Exact limitations, or reproductions of territorial settlements are not to be expected, but such broad lines and markings as will suffice to distinguish continuous causes and effects.

Physical geography has no doubt had much to do with this comparative fixity in the distribution of races and the limits assigned for them. The whole of Asia has been described geographically as divided into two parts by the great chain of mountains which runs from China and the Birman Empire on the east to the Black Sea and the Mediterranean on the west. This wide stretch, enclosing Thibet, Turkestan or Kashgar, and the Valley of Kashmir, near which it

(1) "The Inheritance of the Great Mogul," *Fortnightly Review*, August, 1875.
VOL. XIX. N.S. E

reaches its greatest height, separates Bengal, the Panjaub, Afghanistan, Persia, and great part of the Turkish Empire, from the country of the Mogul and Tûrki tribes, which, speaking generally, occupy the whole extent of country from the borders of China to the Sea of Azof. This vast range may also be regarded as separating, in all ages and in its whole course, nations of comparative civilisation from uncivilised tribes. Mr. Erskine, in his preface to the "Memoirs of Baber," the celebrated Mongol Emperor of Hindostan, remarks with perfect truth that "to the south of this range, if we perhaps except some part of the Afghan territory, which indeed may rather be held as part of the range itself than as south of it, there is no nation which, at some period of its history, has not been the seat of a powerful empire, and of all those arts and refinements of life which attend a numerous and wealthy population when protected by a government that permits the fancies and energies of the human mind to follow their natural bias. North of this, if we except China," he continues, "we find tribes who, down to the present day, wander over their extensive regions as their forefathers did, little if at all more refined than they appear to have been at the very dawn of history ;" or later, he might have added, when Genghis Khan boiled alive, in sixty separate cauldrons set up for that purpose on the Great Steppes, the chiefs of all the tribes who had resisted his arms. "Their flocks are still their wealth, their camp their city, and the same government exists of separate chiefs, who are not much exalted in luxury or in information above the commonest of their subjects around them." So again:—"The belt of mountains that forms the boundary between the pastoral and civilised nations is now, as it always has been, inhabited in all its extent by hill tribes who differ considerably from both of the others."

This immense tract of country (still following the same writer), which is known by the general name of Tartary, extends over nearly all the North of Asia, and a considerable part of the South-east of Europe. It corresponds very nearly with the ancient Scythia. And although the tribes that inhabit it differ from each other to a certain extent in manners, features, and language, the most powerful and numerous would seem to belong to three races: the *Manchus*, who extend from the Eastern Ocean to the North of China, and from whom the present dynasty of Chinese emperors is derived; the *Moghuls* or *Mongols*, who chiefly occupy the central regions between the Manchus and the third, called by Europeans, and more especially the Russians, the *Tartars* or *Tatars*; names not acknowledged by themselves, but who may, as this writer suggests, with more propriety receive their original name of *Turks*, by which their principal branches still designate themselves. None of these three great divisions or classes

have any general name to comprehend the whole tribes of which they consist, each little tribe having a separate name. The grand distinction and affinity are marked chiefly by language.

It has been remarked that the Mongol and Turki tribes have successively changed the aspect of the civilised world. The Huns seem to have been a mixture of both races, though chiefly Mongols. As they swept through the richest provinces of the Empire of the Romans, they broke the already declining force of that mighty people. In the tenth century the rich and cultivated provinces of Samarcand and Kiva, at that period the seats of Oriental science and learning, were subdued by the Turki hordes. In the thirteenth century the Mongols, under Genghis Khan, after having subdued all the Tatar tribes, again overran the intervening countries (including a part of India) as far as the Mediterranean. But the Turcomans from the wilds of Tartary, in the ninth century, and the Turki tribes who accompanied Genghis Khan in the thirteenth, have all been races, owning a common language and origin, and with such affinity as these generally insure. While the cities of Samarcand, Bokhara, and Tashkend were chiefly inhabited by Persians, the Turki long retained their aversion to the life of a town—disliked the drudgery of agriculture, 'for the sake of supporting themselves, on the top of a weed,' as they called wheat, in derision. The Turki was the court language in Persia itself, from its being the mother tongue of the sovereign, who in the days of Baber belonged, as he himself did, to a Turki tribe. So the languages became greatly blended, the Turki borrowing largely from the Persian and Arabic, the latter being the medium through which they received their religion.

The Turki tongue, which still prevails in the extensive tract of country that once formed the inheritance of Chaghatai Khan, the son of Genghis, and which extended from the Ulugh-Tagh mountains on the north, to the Hindu Kush on the south, and from the Caspian Sea on the west to the deserts of Gobi on the east, beyond Kashgar and Yarkand, was a dialect of the language of that extensive division of the Tartar nation. We are further assured by the same good authority, that the language really spoken by that great race is the Tûrki (pronounced *Toorki*), and the language of Kâshghar, of the Crimea, of Samarcand and Bokhâra, of Constantinople, and the greater part of Turkey; of the principal wandering tribes of Persia, and indeed of one-half of the population of that country, of the Turcomans of Asia Minor, as well as those east of the Euxine, of the Uzbeks, the Kirghis, the Karzalis, the Baskirs, and numerous other tribes of Tartary, is radically the same as that of the Chaghatai Turks; and the different tribes speaking them can easily understand and converse with each other. We can the more easily understand, then

how the whole of this vast region might be overrun and held by one of their own race, as by Genghis Khan or his sons after him, and later by Timur "the Tartar."

If now we apply this knowledge and the traditions of the race to more modern times, and add the great element since supplied by the Mahommedan religion, which supplies a common bond of faith and worship, all being subject to the summons of the Commander of the Faithful at Constantinople, we may see how a religious revival among Mussulmen over all the west and centre of Asia might render Russian conquest, and still more permanent Russian dominion, harder to accomplish than is usually assumed. That such a revival, and a religious crusade may be preached against the Giaours, from Constantinople to Yarkand and Delhi, is not impossible, various indications would lead us to conclude. Even while I write the public press speaks of alarming reports having been received from Khokand. "It is stated that the Mohammedans have risen all round the Russians, that all isolated parties have been cut off, and that General Kaufmann, with the main body of his troops, is in danger of being surrounded. The total extirpation of the Russians is even hinted at." These statements are not in any way confirmed by official advices from Russia, and are probably very much exaggerated. But I take such rumours as certain indications of smouldering fires, and a positive danger in that direction.

Again, the conclusion most consistent with these leading facts of past migrations and invasions, is directly opposed to any belief that the territories now occupied by Turks and Persians can ever be permanently held by the same power that rules in Tartary and Siberia, or the Steppes of the Volga and deserts north of the great mountain range running from east to west.

It may be true that so far as race is concerned, the present occupants of both Turkey and Persia can claim relationship with those who now occupy the borders of the Black Sea and the Caspian under Russian rule. The most numerous race, indeed, next to the Slavonians in Russia, it is believed, are the Turks of the northern hordes. The Ottoman empire itself, as well as the Turkish language, owes its origin to the same northern race of Turks or Tartars. But neither *Chaghatai*, the son of Genghis, who held sway over the pastures of Ili and the valley of the Sir Daria, or Jaxartes and all the wealthy cities of Sogdiana; nor the more irrepressible and untamable *Kaidu*, who ranged over Southern Siberia and Eastern Turkestan; or *Barca*, the first ruling prince of the house of Genghis to turn Mahommedan, and who ruled on the banks of the Volga, ever thought of adding to their inheritance the share of *Ilulaku*, which included all the southern lands from Persia to the Bosphorus and the Mediterranean. The portions of the first three have now been united again under one

head, as they were under Genghis; and the question of the present day is how far the portion of Hulaku, the fourth of the Great Mongol's immediate successors and descendants, can be added to the inheritance of the other three. Or how much of the present Turkish and Persian dominions can be absorbed by the "White Khan," and held under one rule, being inhabited in nearly equal proportions by followers of the Prophet and of the Greek Church—the two most intolerant and irreconcilable creeds at this moment rending the provinces west of the Danube, and wasting them with fire and sword. A similar struggle is now being entered upon in Central Asia between Islamism on the one hand, and on the other Buddhism, the older faith, backed by the whole power of the Chinese Empire, where it occupies nearly the same place as the Greek Church in Russia.

It is a striking circumstance that while this war between rival creeds in Eastern Europe is pressing forward, in a premature and precipitate fashion, the "Eastern question," in which all Europe takes so active and absorbing an interest, from the magnitude of the issues involved;—a movement on the part of China, lying at the opposite extremity of Asia, should nearly as inopportunistically force on the Central Asian question, and bring both Russia and England face to face with a war of religion and race of the most ruthless character, in which it is nearly as impossible for either to be passive spectators, as it is for Russia and Austria in the Herzegovina struggle. And it is unfortunate that in Central Asia, England and Russia should have antagonistic interests, and still more unfortunate for Turkestan, which lies between them, with a powerful and implacable enemy in the Chinese on its eastern border. But there are two things which Russia desires, and we of necessity must oppose, as contrary to our security and interests in Asia. The first is to advance her frontiers to the slopes of the Himalayas on the north, and to Merv and Herat on the west, in close proximity to our own, of which Afghanistan is but the outer defensive works. The second is to monopolise all the trade of Central Asia, to the exclusion of our manufactures, and of all competition. In this object the possession of Yarkand and the territories now ruled by Yacoub Beg, would be of great assistance, by opening an easy way into the western, as well as some of the richest provinces of China. To draw the cordon of prohibitive States farther south, and closer on our frontier, would answer both ends—that of a menace to our Indian Empire if unfortunately a war in Europe should array the two countries in opposite camps, and of more effectually shutting out our merchants, and preventing the circulation of Manchester goods, or other profitable traffic, with Central Asia. To prevent both these injurious results *must* be our policy; but is it so certainly imperative on Russia to follow out the two designs attributed to its

Ruler? No doubt there are two influential parties in Russia, one military and the other commercial, which desire to see the fulfilment of both. The military wish to push their frontiers towards India, if not within attacking distance, at least near enough to be a standing menace, and interfere with our policy in Europe. The mercantile wish to open up Central Asia, and the best caravan routes to China, on the East, and Constantinople westward, with a monopoly of all the trade they could develop. Yet even from a Russian point of view, other considerations present themselves of a nature to make it very doubtful, whether they have not more to lose than to gain in such a policy. The Central Asian question of the hour is one which concerns the ultimate destiny of Eastern Turkistan—the “jewel set in sand,” of the Persian poets—snatched from the Chinese only a few years ago, and under the vigorous rule of Yacoub Beg rapidly recovering its lost fertility and prosperous condition. Looking to the history of China, even in the last century, and the way in which they subjugated Thibet, Turkestan, and Nepaul, under similar difficulties of distance, commissariat, and country, it seems most probable that they will persevere, and in the end succeed, if neither Russia nor we ourselves intervene. This opens a grave question for solution, and one that would be better dealt with now than later. The political, religious, and commercial elements are all essential factors, and enter in nearly equal proportions into the problem. If the two principals are to fight it out between them, one of two results may be very confidently predicted. Either the present ruler of Yarkand will triumph and enlarge his present territories at the expense of China; or else, a large Mahomedan population being threatened with extermination by the Buddhists and the Chinese race, of whose former misrule there is a lively recollection, then not only the Mussulmen inhabitants of contiguous countries, such as Bokhara, Afghanistan, and India, may be roused, as followers of the Prophet, to rush to the rescue, but the cry may be taken up as far as the Bosphorus, and a holy war be proclaimed against the infidel. If Turkey, standing at bay, hard driven by her enemies, and looking round in vain for a plank of safety, should take counsel of despair, and give the signal for a war against the Franks, heading back to those great steppes and mountain ranges from which they originally came, Russia might have little cause to rejoice over her recent conquests in Central Asia.

Is this deemed so improbable as to be unworthy of consideration? No attentive observer of what has been taking place in the track of the Russian arms, southward and eastward, during the last ten or twenty years,—and in China, where Mahomedan rebellions have been stamped out by wholesale butchery and devastation in two provinces,—will come to that conclusion. No

reader of the telegraphic news from those regions, and the commentaries supplied from correspondents and travellers—few and unconnected as they are—can fail to be aware that wherever Russia has marked a victory over the fierce nomad tribes, smouldering ashes have been left behind ready to be fanned into a flame and burn anew. India can scarcely fail to feel the disturbing effects, to a greater or lesser extent. If Russia did not desire to profit by the opportunity to obtain a protectorate and the virtual control, as the price of intervention, the Russian and British Governments might both combine with the best results to stay the action of the Chinese in their endeavour to recover possession of such far outlying provinces. And the best interest of the four parties in this transaction would undoubtedly be consulted by such a course. For although it is difficult to believe, if the two combatants are really to be left to themselves, that China would not in the end prevail by superior numbers and resources, there is just a possibility, if Yacoob Beg be really such a man of energy and talent as has been represented, that a considerable empire might spring up under his leadership, between Russia and China. A letter from Tientsin in the *St. Petersburg. Golos*, dated September 16, reports that—

“The Chinese garrison at Khami destined to stay the aggression of the Kashgar troops are suffering dreadfully from famine. If Yakub Beg profits by this opportunity,” the letter proceeds to say, “a vast Empire will spring up between Russia and China, hostile to both, and supported by the Anglo-Indians with a view to the utter destruction of the Celestial Monarchy and the checking of Russia.”

Why it should be necessarily hostile to both is not clear. Still less is there any reason for supposing the Anglo-Indians would willingly help any one to destroy the Celestial Monarchy. On the other hand, every day brings fresh evidence of the desire of Russia to occupy the great Southern caravan route across Central Asia, into Western China and the rich province of Szechuen. From Berlin, on the 7th of December, it was announced by telegram that “Russia is about to ask permission to send her caravans to the Celestial Empire, not only by Kalgan, but also by the Joki-gate to Tungechow and Tientsin.” All very natural and legitimate on the part of Russia, but not the less disquieting to China, and other powers who have large commercial relations with it, not to be advanced by a protected and exclusive Russian trade. We should have no reason to regret any action that would stay the impending savage war; but rather rejoice, if at the same time the free development of an independent Kashgaria could be secured. Apart from the possible collision between Russia and England in Central Asia, the struggle between a Khanate in this region and China, has little interest for the other powers of Europe. Neither any encroachments on Kashgaria or Chinese territory very much concerns them. What

to Russia and to Great Britain, both great Asiatic powers, is of primary importance, and may be vital, neither occupies nor affects them, except in so far as it may have a recoil in Europe, and alter the relations of those two on the field of Western policy.

The step recently taken by the Government in purchasing the Khedive's share of the Suez Canal—which has direct reference to our interests in India and our Eastern possessions, rather than to Europe—has been viewed as a declaration of policy, and a measure of great importance. Not because it might remotely tell upon Russian policy in Central Asia or in China, but because it was interpreted as an abandonment of further effort to rescue Turkey in Europe from dismemberment. That Egypt and the Suez Canal have a prominent part to play, as a link in the chain by which we connect two parts of a great Empire, one in Europe and the other in Asia, is obvious. Egypt occupies the place of a living band uniting the two, and the life and vigour of both are at stake in its maintenance. It is the bridge between the two, and must be maintained at any cost. It has been built with gold, in the desire and hope that it may never require to be cemented with blood. All Europe is to be congratulated therefore, I think, that we have had a Government in opportune time, bold enough to make this plain, without any diplomatic reserve or circumlocution. Happen what may to Turkey, in Europe or in Asia, Egypt is henceforth under the ægis of our national and material interests. An attempt to alter the relative position of the two countries by placing the canal on the basis of an international syndicate or a neutrality, which can hardly be maintained in war, would seem of doubtful expediency. It would be to credit the British nation with singular imbecility, to suppose that in any European war, the first result of which might be an attack on our Eastern possessions or commerce, we would allow our enemies to profit by the shortest road to effect our destruction. To stop all transit or passage to them, would be the first act of any Power having the command of the sea at either end, whoever held the shares. So far as this is concerned, the possession of the whole by ourselves, or any other parties, would make not the slightest difference practically. But if no other advantage should result, our proprietary right to secure, in time of peace, the best administration of a common highway in the interest of all, is worth four millions to a free trade maritime Power, with the largest commerce.

After this rapid survey of the Eastern questions which the relations of Western Powers with Asia have raised, I would ask more special attention to the last group, referring to the Trans-Gangetic East, comprising more than the third of Asia,—the "far East," as it is popularly styled. If Japan be excepted, it may with little inaccuracy be described as the Chinese Empire,

with its dependencies or tributaries. Beginning northward with Korea and Manchuria, and co-terminous, as has been already stated, with the southern frontiers of Russia and Siberia for some three thousand miles, it includes a large tract of Mongolia and Tartary, and in its sweep southward, Thibet and Nepal, the greater part of the Indo-Chinese peninsula, and eastward the eighteen provinces of China proper. For although the British portion of Burmah, with Siam and Cochin China, are not under the rule of the Chinese, or tributary, they are, by the large influx of Chinese colonists, by language and religion, so affiliated to the Chinese group as to live under the influence of the Celestial kingdom. The interest of Western States in this Eastern division of Asia, if we except Russia, is almost exclusively commercial. And even in this restricted sense, nearly two-thirds of the trade is British, and a large portion of the other third is American, and not European. It is not surprising, therefore, that except when, as at present, there is a menace of war, but little interest is excited by our relations with this Eastern third of the Continent. Yet this indifference or neglect, however natural or easily it may be accounted for, is a mistake, so far as we ourselves are concerned. The *Times* is right when it tells us that our concerns with this still almost unknown Empire are of more real importance to the British Empire than many continental disputes about a river or a province.

The extent of our trade, at present amounting to some £40,000,000 sterling of imports and exports, is not any measure of its importance, or gauge of what it might become within a single generation. But apart from this its connection with Indian finance and revenue is one of the gravest significance. Some £7,000,000 is contributed to the revenue by the opium sent to China—from a sixth to a seventh of the whole annual income of our Indian Empire¹—and the difficulty of supplying such a sum from any other source, or dispensing with it, are facts too well known and appreciated to be overlooked. The policy of the Chinese has hitherto been obstructive, jealous, and exclusive, tending steadily to isolation. It would require but a change in this, to open to the West a market exceeding in power of consumption the rest of the world. In population it counts, on the best estimate that can be formed, in the absence of a trustworthy or exhaustive census, nearly a third of the human race. It is worth while, therefore, to turn our attention seriously to the existing conditions of the empire, and the vast dependencies grouped around it;—and to seek the true reason of the isolation maintained from the earliest date, long before the Christian era, and still prac-

(1) The income of 1872-3 amounted to £50,219,489, of which £6,165,630 was derived from the sale of Bengal opium and the duty on *malwa*—a variable amount, and often more.

tically persevered in, all existing treaties and coast trade to the contrary notwithstanding. If we would learn how to deal with a people so singular, and different even from other Asiatics, and gain the power of successfully overcoming the obstacles they oppose to freer intercourse and trade, we must endeavour to understand them, and trace these effects to their causes. To do this we must neither overlook the geographical conditions under which they have become a great people and a separate race, nor the religious, literary, and even the linguistic influences operating continuously through a period of at least three thousand years. No other nation or race has ever been under similar conditions, and in this view, if in no other, they offer every inducement for careful study.

Mr. Douglas in his lectures on the Language and Literature of China,¹ which I am glad to see in print, has supplied in very small compass a great deal of valuable information and suggestive matter, bearing on this point. Speaking of the part which the physical geography of the surrounding regions has played as a primary cause of isolation; he says:—

• “That she should have succeeded in separating herself for so long from the rest of the world is doubtless due in a great measure to the geographical position of the country. Bounded on the east by the sea, on the west by vast sandy wastes, on the south and south-west by mountainous districts for the most part inhabited by tribes whom it is usual to describe as virtually independent and half savage, and on the north by range after range of mountains rising like sharks’ teeth from the plain, and dwarfing into insignificance the ‘Great Wall’ which remains a monument of the folly as well as of the industry of the Chinese race, she has dwelt, like Laish of old, quiet and secure; while at the same time the varied extent and richness of her internal resources has enabled her, without seeking the natural or artificial products of other countries, to supply her people with enough and to spare of all the necessaries of life. Independent then of all the world, beyond comparison more powerful, by reason of her wealth, her size, and the nature of her inhabitants, than any of her neighbours—a very Triton among minnows, admitting no rivals, and courting no alliances, she stood, and was content to stand, alone. Accepting nothing from the world beyond her own frontiers in religion, literature, science, or art, which did not fall in with the national views on these subjects, and which she could not make her own, receiving no impress from without, and rejecting peremptorily everything thrown in her way which was distasteful to her, she brooded over the east of Asia, absorbing only that which assimilated easily with the national tastes and the preconceived ideas of the people.

“Thus, though in the course of the history of China tribes from other parts of Asia have, by force of arms, successfully invaded the country, and have entered in and taken possession, their advent has in no wise affected the national life, and when they have yielded their powers to others, they have left no more distinctive trace behind them than do mountain torrents when they lose themselves in the ocean.”

Next in order of importance, as a determining influence, comes their language. “It is the chief among that small class of languages

(1) “The Language and Literature of China,” two lectures delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain in May and June, 1875, by Robert H. Douglas, of the British Museum, Professor of Chinese at King’s College, London. Trübner & Co.

which includes the Thibetan, Cochin-Chinese, Burmese, Korean, and Chinese, and which is usually described as monosyllabic. It is language in its most archaic form. Every word is a root, and every root is a word. It is without inflexion or even agglutination; its substantives are indeclinable, and its verbs are not to be conjugated; it is destitute of an alphabet, and finds its expression on paper in thousands of distinct symbols. It has little in common with the Indo-European tongues. As a language it is so ancient as to dwarf into insignificance the antiquity of Western tongues, and one which is the solitary medium of communication between four hundred millions of our fellow-men." Mr. Douglas is right, therefore, when he concludes that, "It is time such a language was better understood, and at this period of the world's history we cannot afford to leave it unnoticed," as of little interest or concern except for philological purposes. There could not, indeed, be a greater mistake, as the lecturer conclusively shows in a few brief sentences.

"The position which China, as a nation, has occupied and maintained through so many centuries has been such as to render her the natural depository of the annals of the kingdoms of Central and Eastern Asia. With Burmah, Cochin China, Tibet, Japan, and Corea as her vassals, with a never-ceasing relationship with the tribes of Central Asia, kept up as times and circumstances changed, now as subjects, now as allies, and now as enemies, alone unchanging in her political constitution amidst the recurring wrecks of neighbouring States, she has had the means at her command of collecting masses of ethnological information which are beyond the reach of any other people. The movements of the tribes in Central Asia, to which her policy has largely contributed, are all clearly traced in the Dynastic Annals; and it was with the view of placing the record of these within the reach of European readers that a proposal was recently made to translate, as a beginning, the History of the Han Dynasty."

Not only, however, may it be certainly concluded that the language, taken singly, has exercised a very enduring and important influence in separating, and keeping separate, the large group of cognate states and nations by serving as a common medium of communication for all; but there was that in its very construction which must have materially tended to fix the type of national character and degree of development or progress. The growth of the written Chinese character, from its "first creation as a hieroglyphic to its final development in the more modern ideophonetic form," must be traced, to see how a language so constructed must have reacted on the mind employing it. It is absolutely without inflexion, and the grammar consists so entirely of syntax that "no word can be moved out of its determined position in a sentence without either changing its value or rendering it meaningless." "A language of monosyllabic roots which, as regards the written character," Mr. Douglas suggests, "has been checked in its growth and crystallized in its most ancient form by the early occurrence of a period

of great literary activity, of which the nation is proud, and to the productions of which every Chinaman, even of the present day, looks back as containing the true standards of literary excellence." Language and literature alike, therefore, must have powerfully contributed to isolation. We shall see how plainly these characteristic features of the instrument are reflected in the literature, and that again in the mental habits of the people. By these unyielding withs the whole of these aggregate millions were bound together, and confined within very circumscribed limits of thought and action. In both senses the language and the literature of China have acquired a paramount influence of unparalleled extent and duration. While it has formed the one medium of communication among different varieties of the same race occupying the Eastern half of Asia nearly, it has materially aided political conditions to bind them under one ruler and one code of laws. Just as we have seen the prevalence of the Turki tongue over Central and Western Asia facilitated the dominion of the great Mongol conquerors over such vast regions, and still make, even in our day, scarcely less extensive conquests from Yarkand to the Black Sea, possible. Whatever may be the future destiny of Central and Western Asia, it may safely be assumed that China, as a great centre, will still hold a separate and undivided sway over its four hundred millions of Chinese-speaking and Buddha worshipping subjects.

Whether the various and widely extended dependencies and tributaries of the Chinese Empire may ever again be welded together by an energetic ruler, as they were in the thirteenth century under Kublai Khan, and even much later under the second sovereign of the present Manchu dynasty, Kanghi, in the seventeenth, may be matter of doubt and speculation; but looking to the experience of the past, the possibility of its becoming once more a power formidable to all Asia cannot be questioned. The same elements and power of combination are there with little change. In these conditions, the ruler capable of using them is alone wanting. As to the anticipations sometimes hazarded of the impending disruption of the empire, they may be dismissed as wholly illusory. As little, in my opinion, is there any danger of any European power, not excepting Russia, seriously menacing the integrity of China. Russia, adroit in seizing its opportunity, may as heretofore rectify the existing frontiers largely in its favour, but any half-populated steppes or Siberian wildernesses which it may thus appropriate, are but the fringe and outer binding of the Imperial mantle, and effect no sensible diminution of territory or power. With the eighteen provinces of China proper, closely compacted, teeming with an industrious population of the same race, outnumbering

three-fold the heterogeneous and widely dispersed subjects of the Czar, not only scattered over all Northern Asia and Europe, but of the most diverse origin, neither speaking the same language, nor adopting the same creeds,—it is much more probable that the Russian Empire should suffer disruption than the Chinese. Slav and Turk, Cossack and Tartar, Mahomedan and Christian, all are bound together by no more durable chain than that which an autocratic chief or head of an alien race supplies. Geographical boundaries and physical conditions of soil and climate, combine with a common origin, language, and creed, to give all the advantages to China, and all the disadvantages to its rival in Asiatic sway. How great and enduring are the latter has already been partially shown. A glance at the character of the Chinese literature and the almost unlimited power it has exercised since the days of Confucius in the fifth century B.C. without break or diminution, down to the present day, will prove to demonstration the great advantage of the Chinese in this respect, and the solidity of the foundations on which the empire rests.

The "Four Books" and the "Five Classics," whatever may be their merits or real value tried by European standards, stand alone for "the incomparable influence they have exerted over so many millions of minds." Books which have a wider range and more absolute authority than our own Scriptures—really regulating the thoughts, manners, and customs of a fourth of the whole human race far more efficaciously than any religion has ever yet accomplished—must be estimated by their results. And so far as the prevailing bias, spirit, habits of thought and action are concerned, to read and know their books, is to know the Chinese—both rulers and subjects—as they know themselves. Even were the material interests at stake less important than they manifestly are, there are few who will not be disposed to agree with the lecturer, it is time that the language was better understood, and at this period of the world's history we cannot afford to leave it unnoticed. When we come to study the literature which has exercised such immense authority over the Chinese mind, we see how the inflexible character of the language is reflected in the classics, and these again in the character of the nation. We see how such a language must have cramped the free play and expression of thought, and tended to repress all fancy or originality. We look upon the stolid and matter-of-fact face of the Chinaman, and see no imagination, no gleam of fancy ever brighten his face. He is not wanting in intelligence, or the reasoning faculty, but he has neither inventiveness nor originality, and is the most literal and unimaginative of all men, in the same stage of mental development. As the individual, so is the

nation: impassive, slow to move out of any beaten track, unenterprising, he regards all innovation with an aversion, which has something constitutional and hereditary in its character. How should it be otherwise? Those branches of Chinese literature which are most dependent for their successful development on the powers of imagination, are those which least repay attention. Nevertheless "the Chinese are eminently a literary, in the sense of a reading, people, and the system of making competitive examinations the only royal roads to posts of honour and emolument, and the law which throws these open to everybody who chooses to compete, have caused a wider diffusion of book learning among the Chinese, than is probably to be found among any other people," and therefore it behoves us to know what this book learning teaches.

I may not at present enter into details as to the tenour of this teaching. But a few words on the mode in which the Chinese people make their opinions prevail to a much greater extent than is generally understood, may not be out of place. The Chinese have never had a public press, and, stranger still, they never seem to have felt the want of such means of creating and influencing public opinion, or making the wants of the people known to their rulers. This is chiefly to be accounted for, perhaps, by the fact that in all districts and municipalities, there is a strong democratic element, which leads the different classes and trades to associate together in guilds for mutual defence, and in recognition of a community of interests. In these meetings or gatherings, which take place in their ancestral halls or Consou-houses, built expressly for such purposes, and combining a temple and a guildhall in one, they discuss whatever affects them as members of the same craft or commune. Placards and written protests emanate from such sources, denouncing particular officials or administrative acts, so as to bring home to the chief provincial officers the existence of abuses and of popular discontent. Then, again, the "literati and gentry" form a most influential class, in which is included all candidates for office, and a large number of those who have held office, and either resigned or been dismissed. These generally retire to the place of their birth, where all their relations and connections dwell, so that they can always command a certain following. It is from the ranks of the literati, with few exceptions, that all the offices are filled, and there is a class feeling among them by which they—those who have passed through office—keep up communications with the actual office holders, and with each other, through all the provinces; so that the same opinions and feelings are easily propagated from one province or district to another. That the influence of these educated men must be considerable among the people is clear, and they really

occupy the place, and perform some of the functions of the press in the West, as organs of public opinion. The country may, in a certain sense, be said to be governed by the literati, and those of them who have attained office are too well aware of the power they possess to rouse the people and direct their action, willingly to incur the danger of exciting their enmity. However autocratic and despotic the form of government, both in theory and practice, the Emperor in his palace, and the six boards in Peking, as well as the whole provincial hierarchy, know that there is a limit to their power, and they cannot in many cases venture to adopt measures strongly opposed to the traditions and feelings of the people, or the "literati and gentry," as a body, who can cite passages of Confucius or Mencius condemnatory of their acts.

As no true Mussulman would entertain the notion of transcribing the Koran into any language but that in which Mahommed wrote, so have Chinamen through all ages clung to the form of written character used by Confucius, as the only channel through which his ineffable wisdom should be transmitted to future ages. Thus the written character has remained unchanged, and is, from a Chinaman's point of view, unchangeable. And in the same way they regard his books. Who does not see that the literature and the precepts thus embalmed, like an Egyptian mummy in its dried cerements, a very palimpsest of a bygone age, and stereotyped in an archaic language of symbolic characters, must in the nature of things react on the people who revere it with immovable faith in its unapproachable perfection, and stamp them with the same unchanging characters!

China is not so singular or exceptional, however, in this as we are apt to imagine. Plato also said of his countrymen that they "derived all their knowledge from the ancients, who were wiser and lived nearer to the gods than we." And in our dealings with China we have found—as we are discovering with Turkey—that the difficulty of carrying out any treaty, or observing any compact with either, arises from the assumption that it will or can behave like a civilised state, and as its government chooses. This fallacy underlies most of our difficulties in the East, and has been a fruitful cause of complications. It is the prevailing idea of the Chinese that all other States are, or should be, submissive and tributary, and that, ignorant of the language and classics, we are but barbarians at best. And if this were a more verbal pretension, we might treat it as a harmless delusion, but it is a real conviction, and represents a claim never relinquished. Now if it be true, and who can doubt it, that ideas rule the world, as Mr. Forster lately said in his speech on our Colonial empire, it is essential to take note of such ideas. In the dealings of Western Powers with the East, it will be

found that a knowledge of the leading ideas of Eastern races, and of the influences most constant with their rulers, constitutes the best foundation for successful policy. How far the idea of a "manifest destiny," of which so much has been heard, has determined the policy that has carried Russian arms to Khiva, to Kokand, and to Samarcand, or the whole movement is to be regarded more as a matter of physical geography in the first instance, and of political necessity in the second, when once the frontiers were pushed forward to the pasture grounds of the Kerghis and Turcomans, may be open to discussion. I say of political necessity, because the power of stopping is lost when a civilised State is carried beyond the borders of civilised countries, and into the range of tribes having no affinities of race or creed, and no fixed habitation. The idea, therefore, if it sent the Russians forth on the course of the Oxus, would be answerable only for the initiative steps, and not for the subsequent progress. So with the Mahomedan populations of Western Asia; their common faith in the Koran and its precepts, as of Divine authority, is stronger even than race affinities, and makes common cause against all ghaours and infidels. In Eastern Asia—in China, notably—a common origin, language, history, laws, and faith, all unite to bind some three, if not four hundred millions, in closest union against the rest of the world. With few ideas shared with outside nations, even on Asiatic soil, they have, so to speak, none at all with foreign peoples of Western race. They have a civilisation of their own, dating farther back in history than any of these, of which they are justly proud, and the prevailing idea that governs all their relations with other nationalities, is one of supreme contempt for all outside nations, and an immovable conviction of their own unapproachable superiority and irresponsibility. How naturally their foreign policy takes its shape from this all-pervading idea must be obvious. Ideas, we know, too, have a way of fulfilling themselves; and beyond all doubt the faith of the Mahomedan, be he Turk, or Persian, or Afghan, while it supplies the prevailing motives, mainly shapes the course of action adopted by rulers and subjects alike. For although the policy of Eastern States is to a certain extent determined by the will of the sovereign or ruler, whatever his title—Sultan, Shah, or Khan—it is so only conditionally—that is, on its being in harmony with the prevailing opinion and ideas of the subjects. Therefore it is in vain that Western Powers exhaust their strength in trying to make the Sultan at Stamboul govern his European provinces on Christian principles and after Western models. He cannot so rule, and he would cease to reign if he were induced to make the attempt—of which, however, there is little chance. The ideas which govern the life of his Turkish subjects interpose an inseparable obstacle to any material progress in that direction. The two facts,

taken in connection, go far to justify an opinion which has been put forward by a leading journal as regards our policy in China—to the effect that whatever forces are at work in China should be permitted to have their play without interference from us, not because we are ignorant of their nature, but of our limited capacity to direct them.

This want of power is real, and the more to be regretted, because it is in the nature of things that such prevailing ideas in the Chinese mind, if left unchecked, must bring them into collision with foreign powers, and ourselves the first. And when the conflict comes there is no resulting benefit to be anticipated. It is quite true that “the experience of former wars and their results show that the mere infliction of punishment will make no essential change in the demeanour of the Chinese, and in our relations with them. We may capture fortresses, we may sack a palace, we may levy contributions, we may exact an indemnity; but as soon as we withdraw, the Chinese will hedge themselves in with almost the same exclusiveness, and return after a short interval to the old provocations. They do not need any further proof of the superiority of Europeans in arms. They recognise it, and the recognition is now the dominant influence on their policy.” All this is very true, and there are no guarantees that can be taken for future good conduct on the part of the Government or the people. A province or a citadel would be alike useless and burdensome, and it is beyond the power of Great Britain, or of any Western State, to undertake the tutelage of such an empire as China—larger than Europe itself in area—four or five times the size of India, and with double the population. It is simply an impossibility; and if there were no other insurmountable obstacle in the way, the non-existence of Europeans able to communicate with the people in their own language would alone suffice to make any attempt at government among the millions of a single province impracticable. All the Western world could not produce five competent linguists for each of the eighteen provinces, with a population varying from ten to twenty millions in every one, and larger in extent than some of the first class States in Europe.

It may be well, therefore, as has been recommended, to avoid as long as possible the use of force, since the most successful result has nothing to promise of permanent benefit to the victor. But as for the hope “that peaceful influences will gradually remove the difficulties which now beset our dealings with the race,”—I think it will only be entertained by those who have never known them—even in Blue Books.

What then is the alternative? it will be asked. And what, in presence of a political power so unmanageable, is to be our policy—that shall maintain peace, and yet not encourage hostility and outrage?

This is a problem to tax the powers of the ablest statesmen and the best diplomatists, and it raises so many serious questions, that their further consideration must be deferred to another occasion. In the meantime, as regards existing complications in China and Burnah, consequent on the murder of Mr. Margery and the attack on Colonel Browne's exploring party, it would be premature to come to any conclusion. Until a Blue Book appears, and gives the authentic account of all that has passed, from the first dispatch of the Burmese exploration party to the last agreement with the Chinese Government at Peking, it is impossible to offer any decisive opinion, either as to the conduct of the negotiations, or the policy that originated the expedition. But what has taken place in the interval has well served to bring out the serious difficulties which beset our relations with China and with Eastern Asia generally, including Japan and the Indo-Chinese peninsula.

We have fortunately an exceptional advantage, the value of which can hardly be over-estimated, in the presence of a Minister at Peking who has not only had a life's experience among the Chinese, but is thoroughly conversant with their language and literature. We may rest assured, therefore, that whatever may be the final result of these protracted negotiations, nothing has been lost by any defect of knowledge, or power to deal effectively with whatever arguments may have been brought forward by the Chinese in opposition to demands for satisfaction, and a better observance of the rights secured by treaty.

RUTHERFORD ALCOCK.

GERMAN RAILWAYS: A COMPARISON.

Two years ago it seemed probable that the expediency of the Government purchasing and working the railways of the United Kingdom, or, at all events, the unsuccessful railways of Ireland, would soon become a living political question. It was no longer merely mooted by a few theorists. It was gravely discussed by experts and practical men in the Statistical Society. Some of the chief newspapers took up the subject, and admitted that much might be said in favour of the State purchasing the railways from their present owners. *The Times*, for example, appeared to see no very serious objection to the proposal, except such as arose from an apprehension that the lines could not be acquired at a remunerative price. *The Economist* expressed regret that the matter had not been considered with attention in 1866 and 1867, when railway property was depreciated. A joint committee of both Houses of Parliament, composed of many eminent statesmen, and including Lord Derby, Lord Salisbury, Mr. Childers, and Mr. Chichester Fortescue, reported that "it has become more and more evident that competition must fail to do for railways what it does for ordinary trades, and that no means have yet been devised by which competition can be permanently maintained." The public mind was full of sanguinary railway accidents, and of the letter of advice or remonstrance from the President of the Board of Trade to the chief companies, and it was common to find in the journals arguments that there was no escape from monopoly and its evils, no pledge for safe travelling, except by the acquisition of all or some of the railways by the State. The time was critical. A few more sensational accidents, the conversion of one or two M.P.'s of note, and the declaration of their creed, and why might not we have seen Parliamentary candidates trying upon voters, weary with thrice-told tales and party refrains, the effect of a promise to agitate for State railways? Of course, for good or bad, the contingency is now out of the question. The subject is buried for many a day. The experiment of purchasing the telegraphs is far from encouraging. They cost much, and have produced little; and it is generally felt that their purchase was bungled. The impression of this experience may be deep and durable; and we may perhaps never again hear of the subject in any practical shape. If, however, it is revived and again gravely discussed, let us hope that it will be looked at in the light of the experience of the country where State railways have long existed on a very large scale. Let us hope that abstract reasoning about the necessary character of State manage-

ment will be a little supplemented by a reference to what State management has proved itself to be. The history of Prussian railways will not be decisive for us. The circumstances of England and Prussia are so different that the difficulties of the one country are not bridged by the experience of the other. We must, in the main, take our own course for our own reasons. But perhaps a little acquaintance with the railways of Germany, and especially those of Prussia, would help to drive out of circulation some spurious doctrines and prejudices now current.

No doubt the mass of Englishmen firmly believe that there is something almost repugnant to common sense in the idea of the State constructing and working with success large railways. They are a trifle too prone to assume that State ownership must be synonymous with waste, costliness, jobbery, and inefficiency. It is well that they should observe that to many continental statesmen and perhaps to the mass of Germans the opposite policy of allowing the great highways of communication to fall into the hands of private companies, guided only by the thought of gain, and checked in the exercise of their powers as practical monopolists only by feeble and steadily declining competition, is deemed dangerous and unsatisfactory. Our plan, if plan it can be termed, seems to many continental countries short-sighted, and ill adapted to insure the safety, comfort, and convenience of the public. They compare, not without reason, the sumptuousness and luxury of travelling on the State railways of Germany with the indigent meanness or squalor of some of our lines. They compare, again to their advantage, the safety and punctuality characteristic of railway travelling on the Continent with the perils and uncertainties familiar to English travellers. The fact may surprise us, but it is not the less true, that the English system, which trusts to competition, does not strike most Germans as obviously and decidedly superior to their own. They even hint at the possibility of our learning something on this head from Germany or France. Hitherto, as we must own, it has been different. In the early years of railway development these countries borrowed everything—tools, locomotives, engineering skill, and technical rules—from England. Stephenson and Brunel are the engineers still best known abroad. The name of Bineau, for example, has scarcely travelled out of France. All over the Continent the very terminology of railway officials bears witness to our priority. The German signalman and driver unconsciously remind one of the English origin of railways. Perhaps, however, the experience of other countries may be of use to us in the future. Our own system, or want of it, is not altogether satisfactory. We have not discovered the happy medium between control and *laissez faire*. To leave the railway companies alone would be a course which few would be bold enough to recommend.

Supervision of some sort seems essential ; and yet we find that Mr. Farrer, the Permanent Secretary of the Board of Trade, declares that the interference which it exercises is absolutely useless. Confessions of this sort embolden one to think that perhaps it is not impossible that the country which has taught us to remodel our army, may teach us how to reform, in some respect, our railways.

In Belgium, Holland, and Germany the State has always stood in intimate relation to the railways. To the first of these countries belongs the honour of being the pioneer on the Continent in railway enterprise. To her sagacious king and his Finance Minister, M. Rogier, is due the credit of being the first statesmen to forecast the great future of railways, and to appreciate their inevitable nature. "Whoever possesses a railway," said the latter, as early as 1834, "possesses a monopoly, and such a monopoly ought to be in the hands of the State." Upon this principle the Belgian Government has almost uniformly acted. The first line opened on the Continent was a State line, connecting Brussels and Mechlin, which dates from 1835. Since that time the Belgian Government has never forgotten the principle formulated by M. Rogier. There is now about one-third of the system in its hands, and whatever may be their defects, the Belgian railways are second to none in cheapness of construction, lowness of charges, and extent as compared with the size of the country. In Holland there are comparatively few railways. The abundance of canals and the exceeding cheapness of transport by water dispense with their use so far as heavy goods are concerned ; and we may say that it is only in the transport of passengers and light goods and parcels that the Dutch railways are employed. Of the few that exist—their length in 1870 was only about eight hundred miles—the greater portion belongs to the State. Very varied is the history of railway enterprise in Germany. Especially is this true of Prussia. There prevails a notion, if I am not mistaken, that the Government of that country has exhibited marvellous forethought in regard to this department ; that all has been strictly done in pursuance of a system and a plan long ago conceived ; and that our blunders and vacillations in the construction of railways are reproved by the uniform consistency and wisdom of Prussian legislation. Most of us have heard some speaker in the House of Commons make a good point out of this supposed contrast. This contrast is, however, largely fictitious. There is to be seen in Prussian legislation and policy on this head, along with wisdom and good sense, the evidence of blundering and changes not perhaps quite so great, but very much the same in kind, as our own. The Government did not follow one clearly defined line, but chopped and changed in a manner worthy of a popular Government. When the era of railways began in Prussia,

there were in power ministers who had ideas almost worthy of Colonel Sibthorp. The spirit of the Elector of Mayence, who some hundred and twenty years ago refused to let the postal couriers pass through his territories on the ground that they would go too fast, that they would skip some of the hotels along the route, and that they would introduce dangerous people, was not dead. Metternich's authority was in ascendancy, and it was gravely suspected that railways somehow menaced it. At first the new field was left to private capitalists. Subsequently for a time the State set itself vigorously to get the whole railway system into its hands. The term of office held by Count von Itzenplitz, Minister of Commerce, was a period during which the State had no fixed policy, and in which there prevailed at head-quarters a sort of loose notion that competition was a providential arrangement to save ministers thinking.

At present, the management of the Prussian railways is passing through a transition stage, and the final outcome of the many conferences of directors, drafts of projected laws, and active discussion in the press, is far from clear. Prussia was not the first of the German States in this field. As early as 1835 there had been constructed a small but highly profitable line from Nuremberg to the adjacent town of Fürth, known as the Ludwigsbahn. All over Germany, in a few years after that date, there began a marked movement in favour of the creation of railways. Companies were formed with concessions; the Prussian Government was forced to appreciate the importance of the new means of communication; and in November of 1838 there was passed, in accordance with the report of a commission, a law to regulate the relations of railways to the State. It corresponds with the English Act of 1844, and some of its provisions pointedly recall the English legislation. To the State was reserved the right of purchasing all private lines at the expiration of thirty years after their opening on payment of twenty-five years' purchase, calculated upon the average dividends of the last five years. On the other hand, the companies were secured, by section 44, for thirty years against all competition from lines running in proximity and in the same direction. It is curious that the framers of the Act of 1838 fell into the same mistake as that which was committed in England, and that they conceived the possibility of several companies, nay, the whole public, working the same line with their own carriages and locomotives. Clause 37 of the Act makes provision for such a contingency, which, it is needless to say, has not been realised. To the Minister of Commerce and the Council of Trade the law gave very large and ill-defined powers with respect to the granting of concessions. I may mention as a proof of the desire of the Government to repress speculation and promoters' lines, that

scrip transactions were prohibited, and that an original subscriber could not, by sale or otherwise, divest himself of more than sixty per cent. of his liabilities. Before 1842 ten railways had actually been opened in Prussia, or were in a fair way to be so. In the case of the Berlin-Anhalt-Cöthener line, the State took up about one-seventh of the shares, and guaranteed a loan of £75,000. For a projected railway from Berlin to Stettin it was found impossible to raise the necessary capital; nearly one-fifth of the shares was not subscribed by the public. In these circumstances the Landtag of Old Pomerania came to the rescue, and guaranteed for six years 4 per cent. on a portion not allotted. The Minister of Commerce also supported the projected line, and took up 4 per cent. shares to the amount of £75,000. It was also agreed to waive, so long as the guarantee of the Landtag lasted, the right to one-half per cent. of the dividends on the State shares. This was equivalent to a thrifty subsidy. By-and-by the activity of private enterprise fell off. Just as Prussian statesmen were beginning to appreciate the value of railways in a military and political point of view, especially to a country scattered and naturally disconnected like theirs, capitalists were beginning to withdraw from a field which had lost its novelty, and which did not satisfy their expectations of gain. It was expedient in the highest degree to knit together the Rhenish and the Eastern provinces, to connect outlying Posen with Berlin and the south of Silesia, and to form a junction between Cassel and Frankfort. It was felt that private companies would be tardy in occupying this ground, and it was decided to accelerate the work—as essential to the strength of Prussia as Scharnhorst's military reforms—by the employment of the guarantee system, such as has been resorted to in Ireland to a small extent, and in India on a large scale. When the thoughts of German statesmen were first directed to this subject, the condition of Prussian finances was prosperous. There was a surplus of £240,000—a surplus considerable in comparison with the revenue of the country. After much deliberation it was resolved to appropriate annually £300,000 for the purpose of guaranteeing a dividend of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the capital which it was believed would be required for the lines most urgently demanded.

In 1842 the Finance Minister was empowered to appropriate £75,000 a year for constructing lines, and to increase this amount according as the proceeds of the salt tax should exceed those of 1843. I may add that, to provide for contingencies, the Finance Minister was authorised to keep up the salt tax, and to set aside a sum of £900,000. The arrangements made by the Government with the various companies singled out for favour differed in details. In the majority of instances, the State guaranteed $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to the original shareholders. Not unfrequently it took up a large portion

of the shares ; in the case of the Bergisch-Märkisch railway, for example, the centre of which is at Elberfeld, the Government subscribed one-fourth of the capital. It was stipulated that the State shares should not be sold, and that the dividends should go to form a fund to provide for liabilities under the guarantees. On the other hand, the Government reserved to itself large powers. It could interfere, if it deemed fit, in the administration of the lines. It had a voice in the appointment of the chief officials. Most important of all, it could, if it were compelled to pay contributions in five successive years, or to expend in one year more than $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the guaranteed shares, take the working of a line into its own hands, until the revenue in three successive years amounted to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Soon the State became more deeply committed to this career. 1847 came, with its revolutions and commercial crises. Private enterprise was chilled ; full-blown projects collapsed ; and there was no prospect of an early completion of lines acknowledged to be of the first political importance. The Government came to the rescue, and aided some of those in difficulties. It went further—it began the construction of lines deemed essential to the completion of the Prussian system and the military strength of the country. The East railway, the Westphalian, and Saarbruck lines, were undertaken by the State, and successively completed ; and in a short time the great towns of Prussia were strung upon a thread of lines uniting the east with the west. The Lower Silesian line, too, was purchased. In 1853 a tax was levied upon the railways, and the proceeds were for several years devoted to buying up railway stock. This policy soon passed away. The railway tax was no longer appropriated to one object, but was paid into the general exchequer, and the Government abandoned the design of acquiring all the great lines. The mixed system was accepted as an inevitable fact, and concessions to private companies were freely granted, even in the case of routes of great military importance. The situation was again changed after the close of the war with Austria, and the annexation of the new provinces. The purely State system of Hanover came into the possession of the Prussian Government. In Nassau a mixed system had prevailed ; and there the new Government inherited some railways, and the liability to make others. With the fall of political Particularism, many obstacles to the development of railways were removed. The close of the war of 1870 was the signal for a further extension of the State system. The opening of many hundred miles of new lines was decided upon between 1872 and 1874 ; and the Government also granted guarantees to various new lines, and extensions of old systems.

Such is, in substance, the history of the development of railways in Prussia ; a development which has given that country about nine

thousand miles of railway.¹ It is not the history of any clearly conceived and firmly observed policy. There was no manifesto corresponding to Lord Dalhousie's minute of 1853. The Government has entered or quitted the field according to circumstances. But it may be shown, I think, that a sound instinct has dictated most of the changes, and that the lines of an excellent system were unconsciously laid.

By temperament and their experience in India most Englishmen will be prejudiced against the prodigal use of guarantees. But, to judge of their expediency in Prussia, one must bear in mind circumstances apt to be forgotten. Sometimes the guarantees were given in order to aid the companies in the construction of very costly works; e.g.; the railway bridge at Coblenz. Sometimes, and more frequently, they were granted in order to complete lines deemed of national consequence. It is needless to say that unremunerative railways have been called into existence by these subsidies, and the system has many opponents. But they are not able, so far as I am aware, to point to scandalous abuses or glaring blunders. Without this stimulant, the Prussian railway system would not be so developed as it now is. The cautious German nature is, or was thirty years ago, rather prone to believe the adage *companiei ist lumperiei*, and demanded a certainty. It is also to be recollected that the guarantees were after all only circuitous compensations for the iron and railway taxes paid by the companies; they were, in fact, rough corrections of a bad fiscal system.

As to some points, the excellence of the German system will scarcely be denied. In regard to cheapness and comfort, the German lines compare most favourably with ours. With reference to the Belgian lines, Mr. Galt observes that he was struck by their admirable character, and he adds that "The low charges and the attention paid to the wants and comforts of the working classes formed, indeed, a remarkable contrast with the management of our English railways." Of most of the German lines, and above all, of those which are owned by the State, we may say the same. A reference to *Hendschel* will show that their fares for passengers are decidedly lower than ours. We think, too, that almost universal testimony would declare German carriages to be superior to ours in point of comfort. The second-class carriages on the Bavarian lines are such as English travellers have no experience of. Fitted with cushions, spacious and clean, and provided with hot-air apparatuses, marked *kalt und warm*, they are as good as average English first-class carriages; they are far superior to the first-class carriages of some of the great impecunious companies. A striking proof of the regard

(1) It must be borne in mind that Prussia has few canals. See Emil Richter's *Das Transport Wesesen*.

shown for the comfort of all classes, rich or poor, is the fact that one finds on certain lines fourth-class carriages *für Damen*. When will English companies provide third-class carriages *für Damen*? When will they all provide comfortable third-class carriages *für Männer*? Probably we have something to learn from German companies as to the conveyance of baggage. If furnished with the talisman *schein*, no passenger need trouble himself about his goods. The animated scuffle to be seen at every English terminus—the *mêlée* into which ladies must fling themselves if they would recapture their baggage—is unknown. All goes regularly and in order.

A more surprising point of superiority remains to be mentioned. It is customary to suppose that State management, or interference on the part of the State, is incompatible with cheapness and economy. English experience is probably all in favour of this idea, but I must say that it receives no countenance from the experience of Germany. The German lines, built by or under the control of the Government, or with the aid of Government guarantees, have really been far less costly than ours; and in this point of view the enterprise of our joint-stock companies compares most unfavourably with the results of State management. A few figures, perhaps somewhat surprising, will demonstrate this. Let us take the case of Prussia, and compare the official returns of that country with those of the Board of Trade relative to England. In 1867 the former had expended £78,065,948 in laying down 4,388 miles of rails; in the United Kingdom there had been laid down by the same period 14,247 miles, at an expense of £502,262,887. In other words, the Prussian railways cost £17,790 per mile, the English £35,250, or nearly twice as much. The dearest German railways—the Hamburg-Bergedorfer and the Rhine-bank railways—cost per German mile only 1,100,000 and 1,025,000 thalers respectively; and in some cases the total capital amounted to only 124,000 thalers. It is true that the railways of Germany were built under somewhat favourable circumstances. Their promoters profited by English experience dearly purchased. The lines were not so massively or solidly constructed as ours; a large portion of them consisted of single tracks; seldom are they carefully fenced. Labour was cheap, and the necessary land did not fetch the extravagant prices awarded in England to those whose property was compulsorily taken. Much of the North of Germany is one vast plain, easily traversed by railways; and as the maximum speed is inconsiderable or moderate, sharp curves and steep gradients could be employed. But over and above these natural advantages, there were others, partly due to the connection of the railways with the State. Parliamentary contests were avoided. There was no wasteful competition, ending too surely in amalgamations, and lines

were not created merely to ruin or cut out some rivals. In his *Schule des Eisenbahn-wesens*, a truly admirable work, Herr von Weber accurately explains some of the reasons why the German railway system has, as a whole, been so much cheaper than that of England. German engineers were no imitators of the wasteful daring of Brunel. They avoided tunnelling or building bridges as much as possible, and rarely erected large embankments. They were willing to make long *détours* or sharp curves in order to save expense. Time was deemed of little consequence in comparison with economy. Herr von Weber also points out that the abundance of wood at their command enabled the German engineers to construct much of what they call the *oberbau* at considerably less expense than is incurred here. The result, he says, is very admirable. Though he admits that mistakes have sometimes been committed, and that princes have occasionally diverted railways from the objects of commerce for alien purposes, and have governed them too much as if they were armies, yet he alleges that in the point of view of safety to life and limb the German system is the best in the world. Herr von Weber aptly sums up the characteristics of German railways in a passage which says that "they are distinguished by the great elegance, comfort, and size of the passenger carriages; by the use of the switch system, necessitating large stations; the want of turning-tables; the careful construction of the *oberbau*; general neatness; the great elevation of the lines; the use of embankments and bridges in preference to cuttings and tunnels; sound and optical signals; careful classification of the officials; power of redress in case of complaint lodged with the highest official, and on that account much clerical work and system in all things; great punctuality; moderate speed, but security in all respects; . . . great difficulty in taking important general steps."

It is an axiom based on English experience that the State cannot work any industrial concern in a thrifty, economical manner. Waste and magnificent indifference to expense are invariably associated with the public service; and, so far as the experience derived from our dockyards goes, the popular notion is perhaps right. But we must not exalt provincial saws into universal truths, and the rule scarcely holds good of Germany. In spite of disadvantages and inevitable difficulties unknown here, the working expenses of the Prussian lines do not compare very unfavourably with those of England. For instance, in 1867, the working expenses per mile in Prussia were £1,405; in England and Wales they were £1,670. Of course the true test, however, is the proportion of the working expenses to the gross income; and here the superiority belongs to England. In the above year the working expenses of English railways absorbed 49 per cent., while in Prussia the proportion was

45·41. In 1869 the advantage lay with the Prussian system, the working expenses (inclusive of sinking fund, &c.) having fallen to 42·96 per cent., while those of England stood at 49. In recent years there has been an enormous advance in the price of coals and rate of wages all over Germany—an advance probably greater and more rapid than any we have experienced.¹ Our railways quickly met the rise in the price of coals and iron by raising their tariff; but the Prussian Government resolutely opposed an advance in the rates for goods, the chief source of income, and not until last year did it admit the expediency of an advance of 20 per cent. In fairness this should be borne in mind when the figures which I give, on the authority of Dr. Engel, are read.² He tells us that the outlay in 1870, 1871, 1872, and 1873, in the case of the State lines, came to 47·60, 48·54, 55·13, 69·41 per cent. These are high figures, no doubt; but, besides the partial explanation just hinted at, it should be remembered that the proportion for the first of these years is lower than the English figures; and, secondly, that the great increase in working expenses is not confined to State lines. It is still more strikingly visible in the case of the private lines in Prussia, and no clear argument to the disadvantage of State management can be drawn from the unfavourable results of recent years. In the third place, one must own that, judged by an English standard, the German railways are not, and cannot be, worked up to their full capacity. The country is not studded with large commercial towns; the Germans are not a travelling, excursion-making race; the traffic is necessarily small on all but a few lines. Many of the Prussian lines were avowedly created not to foster trade, but to serve the War Office. More than one-half of them were artificially nursed by the State. It is not wonderful that the revenue per mile is low; in 1870 it was about £2,500, while in England the revenue was more than £3,000.

Herr Schwabe tells us that three times as many trains leave or enter Cannon Street Station in one hour, as leave or enter the Berlin Station of the important Niederschlesisch-Märkisch line in twenty-four hours. Capital and plant are not, and cannot be, used so completely as here. A speaker at the Crefeld Congress of Economists stated that about 60 per cent. of the waggons travel empty, and I find that this estimate is true of some of the lines. More than one-half of

(1) The following sentence from the report of the Verwaltungsrath of the Werra Railway Company will show how prices moved:—"Coal of the first class cost in 1868, 27·4 kr.; 1869, 27·8 kr.; 1870, 28·6 kr.; 1871, 34·1 kr.; and 1872, 36·9 kr. per centner."

(2) Dr. Engel gives the following comparison of increase of wages. In State railways between 1850 and 1869, increase of 65·96 per cent.; in railways under State control, 53·52; private, 67·63. Statistics of later date published in the *Concordia* show a still greater advance since 1870 in wages of railway servants.

the revenue comes from goods ; and, in fact, the condition of the country does not admit of the secret of high earnings—the certainty of return freight. Of course there are some unfavourable artificial influences at work, and chief among them is the routine indifference to waste. Each train, big or little, must start with its full prescribed complement of officials, and the sight is sometimes very like what one sees in a garrison town, where a large military detachment is sent out to bring in the morning rolls for breakfast.

If profits be the test of success, the railways of Prussia must take precedence of those of this country. The bureaucratically governed lines of the former, strangled with red tape, to quote a frequent description, have been far more remunerative than the products of the free untrammelled capital of England. The Prussians possess no populous towns equal to ours ; they are not a commercial people like us ; they do not travel so much as we do ; they have constructed many lines chiefly for political or military reasons ; and yet the return on the capital which they have sunk in railways has on an average been considerably larger than that which has accrued to the owners of English railway shares. I take the following comparative table from Herr Schwabe's pamphlet *Ueber das Englischen Eisenbahnwesen* :—

	English.	Prussian.	Difference.
1860	4.11 per cent.	5.54 per cent.	1.43 per cent.
1861	4.06 „	5.07 „	1.01 „
1862	3.85 „	4.85 „	1.0 „
1863	3.99 „	5.26 „	1.27 „
1864	4.23 „	4.56 „	0.33 „
1865	4.11 „	5.98 „	1.87 „
1866	4.01 „	5.75 „	1.74 „
1867	3.91 „	5.54 „	1.63 „ •

Herr Von Weber's *Die Schule des Eisenbahnwesens* enables us to continue the table. •

	English.	Prussian.	Difference.
1868 ¹	per cent.	6.1 per cent.	per cent.
1869	4.41 „	6.5 „	2.09 „
1870	4.66 „	7.0 „	2.34 „

Another result, also in favour of the State lines, must be here mentioned. I find that in 1871, 1872, and 1873, the return on the capital expended in the Prussian State lines was 7.15, 5.94, and 5.36, while in the same periods the returns of the private lines was 6.29, 5.61, and 4.59. All these results are superior to the English returns.²

Unlike the English system, the German has many centres. Each little State had its network with its own regulations, tariffs, and signal system. The politically divided condition of the country was

(1) Not given by Board of Trade.

(2) Zeitschrift des Königlich. Preussischen Statistischen Bureau's, 1875.

faithfully reflected in the character of the railways. Particularism was the law in regard to them as well as in regard to politics. Even now, though order begins to appear, there is waste and trouble produced by the existence of some seventy or eighty independent boards.¹ The chief agency in establishing order is the powerful federation known as the *Verein deutscher Eisenbahn Verwaltungen*—a fluctuating federation which includes some eighty or ninety railways, State and private, German, Austrian, Belgian, and Dutch. Ruling as it does about twenty thousand miles of railway, the *Verein* has great power to do good. It facilitates through traffic; to some extent it regulates the tariff; and its regulations formed the basis of the railway law of the North German Bund, and subsequently of the Empire. Other agencies have also aided in this work of simplification. Amalgamations there have, of course, been; but in most cases in place of amalgamations the German railways have resorted to loose federations with mutual working arrangements and uniform tariffs. The first of these to be formed was the North German. It was founded in 1848, and its termini are Berlin, Hamburg, Bremen, and Cologne. Then came the German Central system, founded in 1852, with Hamburg, Lübeck, Weimar, Dresden, Halle, Frankfort-on-the-Maine, Frederickshaven, and Basle as termini; the Rhenisch-Thuringer, founded in 1853, with Aix-la-Chapelle, Cologne, Dortmund, Cassel, and Leipsig as its termini; and the West German with Berlin, Halberstadt, Harburg, Bremen, Emden, Brunswick, Cassel, Frankfort-on-the-Maine, Heidelberg, and Mannheim. By-and-by the German Central and the West German were united in a new alliance, the German Central. Still more important is the influence exercised by the Government in favour of unity of management. Directly and indirectly, by the example which these lines set to private companies, and the influence which they are free to exercise, they can do much to create unity; and it is not improbable that these combined influences may before many years elapse form a homogeneous system from the Rhine to the Vistula. "Germany," said List many years ago, "is plainly called upon to become the centre and heart of the European system of transport;" and his prophecy is being fulfilled.² No empty form is the pledge of the new Empire to work the entire railways of Germany on an uniform system.

In Germany we meet with a school of economists whose first and last word in answer to all complaints is "competition." They believe that if the restriction placed by the law of 1838 on parallel

(1) The diversity is still very great. "We have in Germany perhaps three hundred different forms of waggons, while at most ten sorts for passengers and goods traffic would suffice.—"Deutsche Eisenbahnpolitik," Perrot, p. 49.

(2) *Verfassung des Deutschen Reichs*, Article 42. The great permanent obstacle to railway unity on the Continent is the Russian gauge.

lines is removed; if concessions are freely granted; and if capital is not coaxed out of its natural channel by subsidies or guarantees, the public will obtain all that they can fairly desire. Dr. Otto Michaelis, the ablest advocate of this view, points to one fact of importance in favour of his opinion.

"In certain circumstances," says he, "lines running in opposite directions will also be rivals, and will tend to reduce each other's fares;" and he cites the cases of the Trieste-Vienna line, which competes with the Hamburg-Vienna route, and of the Berlin Westphalian, which competes with the Berlin-Silesian and Berlin-Stettin, for the iron and coal traffic. His theory and hope are that when a natural monopoly becomes very decided or pronounced, and inconvenient, the money wherewith to build a rival line is sure to be forthcoming, if bureaucracy does not stop the way; if the requisite capital be not supplied, the hardships of the public cannot be serious, and no abuse can exist. Monopoly is in his view only a nickname for property becoming so remunerative as fairly to reward capitalists for large outlay and much risk. So much for his answer to those who talk of the monopoly of railways. Ingenious are the reasons he gives for shutting his own eyes to some obvious facts; whether he will persuade others to do so, one may doubt.¹

I must mention yet another respect in which the railway management of Prussia is perhaps ahead of ours. Here our companies have yet scarcely mooted the subject of uniform tariff and rates. The Acts of Parliament regulating the maximum tolls are pervaded by no principle; and though the companies are not guided by the Parliamentary regulations, there prevails wonderful diversity in practice. Such also is the case in Germany. But there the diversity is disappearing. The subject excites the deepest interest; and it may be that we are about to see a reform scarcely second to the introduction of the penny postage. One favourite proposal is to charge the same amount per centner and mile on all lines, no matter what their history or condition. Another proposal—actually adopted on the Alsace and Lorraine lines—is the *Wagenraumtarif*; goods being charged according to bulk. So far as any rule at present exists, its effect is to establish a sort of *ad valorem* tariff by which raw materials are subject to low rates, half-manufactured articles to higher, and finished goods to the highest. The constitution of the Empire reserves power to equalise and control the railway tariffs, especially in favour of raw materials; and though lamentable diversity exists—though intermediary stations complain of the differential rates imposed upon them to the advantage of termini—the German railway world is rapidly realising an

(1) "Scarcely do two competing lines exist—moreover with small advantage to the public—than they come into one hand."—Richter, "Das Transport Unwesen."

idea scarcely mooted here—intelligible and equal tariff universally observed.¹

It has been said by writers of authority that, in spite of the greater density of our traffic, "the total loss in life and injuries is comparatively less" in England than in Prussia. The assertion is made on the strength of figures which are probably misread. No doubt it is true that the total number of accidents (*unfälle*) appear very great. For instance, in 1870 there was one person injured in the forwarding of every sixty thousand persons. This proportion seems terrible; but, as was pointed out by Herr von Weber in some interesting articles contributed to the *Gartenlaube*, the Prussian statistics comprehend suicides and accidents to servants. Looking only to the risks run by passengers, the returns tell a different tale. They show, in fact, that travelling in Prussia is about ten times as safe as here. Take 1870, for example; only one Prussian passenger to every three millions was injured; the proportion in England in 1870 was about one to three hundred thousand. It has also been said that it is difficult, if not impossible, to unite with a State system any possibility of granting compensation for injuries to life or property. This difficulty, however, has been solved in Prussia. So far as goods are concerned, the railways are subject to rules substantially identical with the duties imposed on our railways by common law.² So far as the safety of passengers is concerned, the companies are subject to responsibilities perhaps even heavier than those imposed on English lines.

It is no doubt said with some truth that the German railways are subject to a needless and injurious amount of official interference. But this is true only if subjected to large reservations. The policies of the various German Governments differ much. In Prussia it is becoming the creed of a great many economists, that while the Government is called upon to control and appropriate the great channels of communication, it would be an error to interfere much with minor lines—*secondärer bahnen* ought to be left to the judgment of private capitalists. The actual interference on the part of the Government is more apparent than real; the control which is here exercised by the law courts under the Railway and Canal Act of 1854, in Germany often takes the form of a Ministerial rescript.

It would be idle to deny the superiority of the English railways in many respects. In point of expeditiousness there is no comparison. The *schnellzug* and the *courierzug* are only metaphorically swift.³ Thirty-

(1) Compare the curiosities of English legislation with respect to tariffs mentioned in the introduction of Mr. Glen's edition of "Shelford's Law of Railways."

(2) For history of discussion leading to this law see Dr. Koch's "Allgemeines Deutsches Handelsgesetzbuch."

(3) For principles on which German lines should be managed see "Staatsaufsichtsbehörde für Eisenbahnen. Wien, 1875."

five miles an hour is about the extreme limit, and as a rule travelling in Prussia is conducted at the rate of twenty to twenty-five miles. One must also admit that the convenience of German merchants and traders is not so much consulted as it might be. Rife and loud are the complaints that railways governed according to hard-and-fast lines by a bureaucracy do not accommodate themselves to commercial necessities and changes. There is a little of the meddle and muddle policy, and the German lines might learn a very great deal from the intelligent and elastic management of our great English companies. But one must protest against Germany being cited as a proof that the State can touch such matters only to blunder. On the whole, her experience runs strongly in an opposite direction. Her testimony is that State management or ownership is compatible with, and may be perhaps the cause of, many advantages and conveniences which are not ours. There are few instances of wasteful competition or of reckless extensions, bringing in their train private calamities, and perhaps public crises. Shareholders as a rule get moderate dividends. The companies are not deeply in debt, and it would perhaps be impossible to find in German railway history any transactions akin to those which form the history of the Chatham and Dover, the Metropolitan, and so many other English companies.

Many partisans there are of private railways, and many persons are in favour of State ownership. The former must admit that it is difficult, if not impossible, to maintain healthy competition, or to prevent the formation of dangerous monopolies. The latter must, of course, own that there are drawbacks attending any State system—want of enterprise, love of routine, and indifference to changing public wants. Perhaps the foregoing remarks may prompt the reflection that for a mixed system, such as that of Prussia, much may be said. Rival private companies too surely end their struggles by amalgamation; but there is one form of competition which need not end, and that is competition between State lines and private. The State need not, and in Prussia does not, construct lines for the express purpose of underselling private companies. It calls into existence a different system, and between the two there is a healthy rivalry, which benefits the public without crippling the companies. Perhaps also the foregoing remarks may impress some minds with the thought that Prussia has taken the natural course. She has dealt with her railways as all or most countries have dealt with their roads. She has laid hold of some twelve of the great thoroughfares. She has hastened to secure cheap and commodious communication between the chief seats of population. She has left the carrying out of details to private enterprise and local spirit. It was thus that the oldest forms of highways were made, and one sees no reason to doubt the wisdom of Prussia in treading in the old paths.

JOHN MACDONELL.

THE MYTH OF DEMETER AND PERSEPHONE.¹

No chapter in the history of human imagination is more curious than the myth of Demeter, and Kore or Persephone. Alien in some respects from the genuine traditions of Greek mythology, a relic of the earlier inhabitants of Greece, and having but a subordinate place in the religion of Homer, it yet asserted its interest, little by little, and took a complex hold on the minds of the Greeks, becoming finally the central and most popular subject of their national worship. Following its changes, we come across various phases of Greek culture, which are not without their likenesses in the modern mind. We trace it in the dim first period of popular conception; we see it connecting itself with many impressive elements of art, and poetry, and religious custom, with the picturesque superstitions of the many, and with the finer intuitions of the few; and besides this, it is in itself full of interest and suggestion, to all for whom the ideas of the Greek religion have any real meaning in the modern world. And the fortune of the myth has not deserted it in later times. In the year 1780, the long-lost text of the Homeric hymn to Demeter was discovered among the manuscripts of the library at Moscow; and, in our own generation, the tact of an eminent student of Greek art has restored to the world the buried treasures of the little temple and precinct of Demeter at Cnidus, which have many claims to rank in the central order of Greek sculpture. The present essay is an attempt to select and weave together, for the general reader, whatever details in the development of this myth, arranged with a view rather to a total impression than to the controversy of particular points, may seem likely to increase his stock of poetical impressions, and to add to this some criticisms on the expression which it has left of itself in extant art and poetry.²

The central expression then of the story of Demeter and Persephone is the Homeric hymn, to which Grote assigns a date at least as early as six hundred years before Christ. The one survivor of a whole flight of hymns on this subject, it was written perhaps for one of those contests which took place on the seventh day of the Eleusinian festival, and in which a bunch of ears of corn was the prize; perhaps for actual use in the mysteries themselves by the Hierophantes or Interpreter, who showed to the worshippers at Eleusis those sacred places to which the poem contains so many references.

(1) A lecture delivered, in substance, at *The Birmingham and Midland Institute*.

(2) I have derived much assistance in the composition of this essay from Preller's able work, *Demeter und Persephone, ein Cyclus Mythologischer Untersuchungen*.

About the composition itself there are many difficult questions, and various surmises as to why it has remained only in this unique manuscript of the end of the fourteenth century. Portions of the text are missing, and there are probably some additions by later hands; yet most scholars have admitted that it possesses some of the true characteristics of the Homeric style, some genuine echoes of the age immediately succeeding that which produced the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. What follows is an abbreviated version of this hymn.

I.

"I begin the song of Demeter," says the prize-poot, or the Interpreter of the holy places, "the song of Demeter and her daughter Persephone, whom Aidoneus carried away, by the consent of Zeus, as she played, apart from her mother, with the deep-bosomed daughters of the Ocean, gathering flowers in a meadow of soft grass, roses, and the crocus, and fair violets, and flags, and hyacinths, and, above all, the strange flower of the Narcissus, which the Earth, favouring the desire of Aidoneus, brought forth for the first time, to snare the footsteps of the flower-like girl. • A hundred heads of blossom grew up from the roots of it, and the sky and the earth and the salt wave of the sea were glad at the scent thereof. She stretched forth her hands to take the flower; then the earth opened, and the king of the great nation of the dead sprang out with his immortal horses. He seized the unwilling girl, and bore her away weeping on his golden chariot. She uttered a shrill cry, calling upon her father Zeus; but neither man nor god heard her voice, nor even the nymphs of the meadow where she was playing; except Hecate only, the daughter of Persæus, sitting, as ever, in her cave, half veiled with a shining veil, thinking delicate thoughts; she, and the Sun also, heard her.

"So long as she could still see the earth, and the sky, and the sea with its great waves moving, and the beams of the sun, and still thought to see again her mother and the race of the ever-living gods, so long hope soothed her in the midst of her grief. The peaks of the hills and the depths of the sea echoed her cry. Then her mother heard it. A sharp pain seized her at the heart; she tore away the veil from her hair, and cast her blue hood down from her shoulders, and fled forth like a bird, seeking Persephone over dry land and sea. But neither man nor god would tell her the truth; nor did any bird come to her as a sure messenger.

"Nine days she wandered up and down upon the earth, having blazing torches in her hands; and in her great sorrow she refused to taste of ambrosia, or of the cup of the sweet nectar, nor washed her face. But when the tenth morning came, Hecate met her,

having a light in her hands. But Hecate had heard the voice only, and had seen no one, and could not tell Demeter who had borne the girl away. And Demeter said not a word, but fled away swiftly with her, having the blazing torches in her hands, till they came to the Sun, the watchman both of gods and men; and the goddess questioned him, and the Sun told her the whole story.

"Then a more terrible grief took possession of Demeter, and, in her anger against Zeus, she forsook the assembly of the gods and abode among men, for a long time veiling her beauty under a worn countenance, so that none who looked upon her knew her, until she came to the house of Celeus, who was then king of Eleusis. She sat down in her sorrow at the wayside by the virgin's well, where the people of Eleusis came to draw water, under the shadow of an olive-tree. She seemed as an aged woman whose season of child-bearing has gone by, and from whom the gifts of Aphrodite have been withdrawn, like one of the hired servants, who nurse the children or keep house, in kings' palaces. And the daughters of Celeus, four of them, like goddesses, possessing the flower of their youth, Callidice, Cleisidice, Demo, and Callithoe, the eldest of them, coming to draw water that they might bear it in their brazen pitchers to their father's house, saw Demeter and knew her not. The gods are hard for men to recognise.

"They asked her kindly what she did there alone; and Demeter answered dissemblingly that she had escaped from certain pirates, who had carried her from her home and meant to sell her as a slave. Then they prayed her to abide there while they returned to the palace, to ask their mother's permission to bring her home.

"Demeter bowed her head in assent; and they, having filled their shining vessels with water, bore them away, rejoicing in their beauty. They came quickly to their father's house, and told their mother what they had seen and heard. Their mother bade them return, and hire the woman for a great price; and they, like the hinds or young heifers leaping in the fields in spring, fulfilled with the pasture, holding up the folds of their raiment, sped along the hollow roadway, their hair, in colour like the crocus, floating about their shoulders as they went. They found the glorious goddess still sitting by the wayside, unmoved. Then they led her to their father's house; and she, veiled from head to foot, in her deep grief, followed them on the way, and her blue robe gathered itself as she walked in many folds about her feet. They came to the house, and passed through the sunny porch, where their mother was sitting against one of the pillars of the roof, having a young child in her bosom. They ran up to her; but Demeter crossed the threshold, and, as she passed through, her head rose and touched the roof, and her presence filled the doorway with a divine brightness.

“Still they did not wholly recognise her. After a time she was made to smile. She refused to drink wine, but tasted of a cup mingled of water and barley, flavoured with mint. It happened that Metaneira had lately borne a child. It had come beyond hope, long after its elder brethren, and was the object of a peculiar tenderness and of many prayers to all. Demeter consented to remain, and become the nurse of this child. She took the child in her immortal hands, and placed it in her fragrant bosom; and the heart of the mother rejoiced. Thus Demeter nursed Demophoon. And the child grew like a god, neither sucking the breast, nor eating bread; but Demeter daily anointed it with ambrosia, as if it had indeed been the child of a god, breathing sweetly over it and holding it in her bosom; and at nights, when she lay alone with the child, she would hide it secretly in the red strength of the fire, like a brand; for her heart yearned towards it, and she would fain have given to it immortal youth.

“But the foolishness of his mother prevented it. For a suspicion growing up within her, she bided her time, and one night peeped in upon them, and thereupon cried out in terror at what she saw. And the goddess heard her; and, a sudden anger seizing her, she plucked the child from the fire and cast it on the ground—the child she would fain have made immortal, but who must now share the common destiny of all men, though some inscrutable grace should still be his, because he had lain for awhile on the knees and in the bosom of the goddess.

“Then Demeter manifested herself openly. She put away the mask of old age, and changed her form, and the spirit of beauty breathed about her. A fragrant odour fell from her raiment, and her flesh shone from afar; the long yellow hair descended waving over her shoulders, and the great house was filled as with the brightness of lightning. She passed out through the halls; and Metaneira fell to the earth, and was speechless for a long time, and remembered not to lift the child from the ground. But the sisters, hearing its piteous cries, leapt from their beds and ran to it. Then one of them lifted the child from the earth, and wrapped it in her bosom, and another hastened to her mother’s chamber to awake her; they came round the child, and washed away the flecks of the fire from its panting body, and kissed it tenderly all about; but the anguish of the child ceased not; the arms of other and different nurses were about to enfold it.

“So all night, trembling with fear, they sought to propitiate the glorious goddess; and in the morning they told all to their father, Celeus. And he, according to the commands of the goddess, built a fair temple; and all the people assisted; and when it was finished every man departed to his own home. Then Demeter returned, and

sate down within the temple-walls, and remained still apart from the company of the gods, alone in her wasting regret for her daughter Persephone.

“And in her anger she sent upon the earth a year of grievous famine. The dry seed remained hidden in the soil; in vain the oxen drew the ploughshare through the furrows; much white seed-corn fell fruitless on the earth, and the whole human race had like to have perished, and the gods had no more service of men, unless Zeus had interfered. First he sent Iris, afterwards all the gods, one by one, to turn Demeter from her anger; but none was able to persuade her; she heard their words with a hard countenance, and vowed by no means to return to Olympus, nor to yield the fruit of the earth, until her eyes had seen her lost daughter again. Then, last of all, Zeus sent Hermes into the kingdom of the dead, to persuade Aidoneus to suffer his bride to return to the light of day. And Hermes found the king at home in his palace, sitting on a couch, beside the shrinking Persephone, consumed within herself by desire for her mother. A doubtful smile passed over the face of Aidoneus; yet he obeyed the message, and bade Persephone return; yet praying her a little to have gentle thoughts of him, nor judge him too hardly, who was also an immortal god. And Persephone arose up quickly in great joy; but before she departed, he caused her to eat a morsel of sweet pomegranate, designing secretly thereby that she should not remain always upon earth, but might some time return to him. And Aidoneus yoked the horses to his chariot; and Persephone ascended into it; and Hermes took the reins in his hands and drove out through the infernal halls; and the horses ran willingly; and they two quickly passed over the ways of that long journey, neither the waters of the sea, nor of the rivers, nor the deep ravines of the hills, nor the cliffs of the shore, resisting them; till at last Hermes placed Persephone before the door of the temple where her mother was; who, seeing her, ran out quickly to meet her, like a maenad coming down a mountain-side dusky with woods.

“So they spent all that day together in intimate communion, having many things to hear and tell. Then Zeus sent to them Rhea, his venerable mother, the oldest of divine persons, to bring them back reconciled to the company of the gods; and he ordained that Persephone should spend two parts of the year with her mother, and one third part only with her husband, in the kingdom of the dead. So Demeter suffered the earth to yield its fruits once more, and the land was suddenly laden with leaves and flowers and waving corn. Also she visited Triptolemus and the other princes of Eleusis, and instructed them in the performance of her sacred rites—those mysteries of which no tongue may speak. Only, blessed is he whose eyes have seen them; his lot after death is not as that of other men!”

II.

In the story of Demeter, as in other Greek myths, we may trace the action of three different influences, which have moulded it with varying effects, in three successive phases of its development. There is first its mystical phase, in which, under the form of an unwritten legend, living from mouth to mouth, and with details changing as it passes from place to place, there lie certain primitive impressions of the phenomena of the outward world. We may trace it next in its poetical or literary phase, in which the poets become the depositaries of the vague product of the popular imagination, and handle it with a purely literary interest, fixing its outlines, and simplifying or developing its situations. Thirdly, the myth passes into the ethical phase, in which the persons and the incidents of the poetical narrative are realised as abstract symbols, because intensely characteristic examples, of moral or spiritual conditions. Behind the adventures of the stealing of Persephone and the wanderings of Demeter in search of her, as we find them in the Homeric hymn, we may discern the confused conception under which that early age, in which the myths were first created, represented to itself those changes in physical things, that order of summer and winter, of which it had no systematic explanation, but in which nevertheless it divined a multitude of living agencies, corresponding to those ascertained forces of which our colder modern science tells the number and the names. Demeter—Demeter and Persephone, at first, in a sort of confused union—is the earth, in the fixed order of its annual changes, but also in all the accident and detail of the growth and decay of its children. Of this conception, floating loosely in the air, the poets of a later age take possession; they create Demeter and Persephone as we know them in art and poetry. From the vague and fluctuating union, in which together they had represented the earth and its changes, the mother and the daughter define themselves with special functions, and with fixed, well-understood relationships, the incidents and emotions of which soon weave themselves into a pathetic story. Lastly, in proportion as the literary or æsthetic activity completes the picture or the poem, the ethical interest makes itself felt. These persons—Demeter and Persephone, these events—the carrying away into Hades, the seeking of Demeter, the return of Persephone to her, lend themselves to the elevation and correction of the sentiments of sorrow and awe, by the presentment to the senses and the imagination of an ideal expression of them. Demeter cannot but seem the type of divine grief. Persephone is the goddess of death, yet with a promise of life to come. These three phases, which are more or less discernible in all mythical development, and constitute a natural order in it, based on the

necessary conditions of human apprehension, are fixed very plainly in the story of Demeter. And as the Homeric hymn is the central expression of its literary or poetical phase, so the marbles, of which I shall have to speak afterwards, are the central extant illustration of what I have called its ethical phase.

Homer knows Demeter, but only as the goddess of the fields, the originator and patroness of the labours of the countryman, in their yearly order. She stands with her yellow hair at the threshing-floor, and takes her share in the toil, the heap of corn whitening, as the flails, moving in the wind, disperse the chaff. Out in the fresh fields, she yields to the embraces of Iasion, to the extreme jealousy of Zeus, who slays her mortal lover with lightning. The flowery town of Pyrasus—the *wheat-town*—an ancient place in Thessaly, is her sacred precinct. But when Homer gives a list of the gods, her name is not mentioned.

Homer knows Persephone also, but not as Kore, only as the queen of the dead—ἐπαινὴ Περσεφόνη, dreadful Persephone, the goddess of destruction and death, according to the apparent import of her name. She accomplishes men's evil prayers; she is the mistress and manager of men's shades, to which she can dispense a little more or less of life, dwelling in her mouldering palace on the steep shore of the Oceanus, with its groves of barren willows and tall poplars. But that Homer knew her as the daughter of Demeter there are no signs; and of his knowledge of the stealing of Persephone there is only the faintest sign—he names Hades by the golden reins of his chariot, and his beautiful horses.

The main theme, then, the most characteristic peculiarities, of the story, as subsequently developed, are not to be found in Homer. We have in him, on the one hand, Demeter, as the perfectly fresh and blithe goddess of the fields, whose children, if she has them, must be as the perfectly discreet and peaceful Kore; on the other hand, we have Persephone, as the wholly terrible goddess of death, who brings to Ulysses the querulous shadows of the dead, and who has the head of the gorgon Medusa in her keeping. And it is only when these two contrasted images have been brought into intimate relationship, only when Kore and Persephone have been identified, that the true mythology of Demeter begins.

This combination has taken place in Hesiod; and in three lines of the *Theogony* we find the stealing of Persephone by Aidoneus,¹ one of those things in Hesiod, perhaps, which are really older than Homer. Hesiod has been called the poet of helots, and is thought

(1) *Theogony*, 912—914:

Αὐτὰρ ὁ Δήμητρος πολυφύρβης ἐς λείχος ἤλθεν,
 ἥ τίς τε Περσεφόνην λευκώλενον, ἥν' Αἰδωνεύς
 ἤρπασεν ἥς παρὰ μητρὸς· ἔδωκε δὲ μητίετα Ζεὺς.

to have preserved some of the traditions of those earlier inhabitants of Greece who had become a kind of serfs; and in a certain shadowiness in his conceptions of the gods, contrasting with the concrete and heroic forms of the gods of Homer, we may perhaps trace something of the quiet brooding of a subdued people—of that dreamy temper to which the story of Persephone properly belongs. However this may be, it is in Hesiod that the two images, divided in Homer—the goddess of summer and the goddess of death, Kore and Persephone—are identified with much significance; and that strange dual being makes her first appearance, whose latent capabilities the poets afterwards developed, among the rest, a peculiar blending of those two contrasted aspects, full of purpose for the duly chastened intelligence. *Awake, and sing, ye that dwell in the dust.*

Modern science explains the changes of the natural world by the hypothesis of certain unconscious forces; and the sum of these forces in their combined action constitutes its conception of nature. But side by side with the growth of this more mechanical conception, an older and more spiritual philosophy has always maintained itself, a philosophy more of instinct than of the understanding, the starting-point of which is not an observed sequence of phenomena, but some such feeling as most of us have on the first warmer days in spring, when we seem to feel the genial processes of nature actually at work; as if just below the mould, and in the hard wood of the trees, there were really circulating some spirit of life akin to that which makes its energies felt within ourselves. Starting with a hundred instincts such as this, that older philosophy envisages nature rather as the unity of a living spirit or person, revealing itself in various degrees to the kindred spirit of the observer, than as a system of mechanical forces. Such a philosophy is a systematized form of that sort of poetry which also has its fancies of a spirit of the earth, or of the sky, a personal intelligence abiding in them, the existence of which is assumed in every suggestion it makes to us of a sympathy between the ways and aspects of outward nature and the moods of men. What stood to the primitive intelligence in place of such conceptions were the cosonical stories or myths, which, springing up spontaneously in many minds, came at last to represent to them, in a certain number of sensibly realised images, all they knew, felt, or fancied of the natural world about them. The sky in its unity and its variety, the sea in its unity and its variety, mirrored themselves respectively in these simple, but profoundly impressible spirits, as Zeus, as Glaucus or Poseidon. And a large part of their experience—all, that is, that related to the earth in its changes, the growth and decay of all things born of it—was covered by the story of Demeter, the myth of the earth as a mother. They thought of Demeter as the old Germans

thought of Hertha, or the later Greeks of Pan, as the Egyptians thought of Isis, the land of the Nile, made green by the streams of Osiris, after whom Isis longs, as Demeter after Persephone; naming together in her all their fluctuating thoughts, impressions, suspicions of the earth and its appearances, their whole complex divination of a mysterious life, a perpetual working, a continuous act of conception there. Or they thought of the many-coloured earth as the garment of Demeter, as the modern pantheist speaks of it, as the "garment of God." Its brooding fertility; the spring flowers breaking from its surface, the thinly disguised unhealthfulness of their heavy perfume, and of their chosen places of growth; the delicate motion of all growing things; its fruit, full of drowsy and poisonous, or fresh, reviving juices; its sinister caprices also, its droughts and sudden heats; the long delays of spring; its dumb sleep, so suddenly flung away; the sadness which insinuates itself into its languid luxuriance; all this grouped itself round the persons of Demeter and her circle. They could turn always to her, from the actual earth itself, and explain it through her, in its sorrow and its promise, its darkness and its helpfulness to man.

The personification of abstract ideas by modern painters or sculptors, shocks, in most cases, the æsthetic sense, as something conventional or rhetorical, as a mere transparent allegory, or figure of speech, which could please almost no one. On the other hand, such symbolical representation, under the form of human persons, as Giotto's *Virtues* and *Vices* at Padua, or his *Saint Poverty* at Assisi, or the series of the planets in the early Italian engravings of Baldini, is profoundly poetical and impressive; it seems to be something more than mere symbolism, and to be connected with some peculiarly sympathetic penetration, on the part of those artists, into the subjects they intended to depict. Symbolism, so intense as this, is the creation of a special temper, in which a certain simplicity, taking all things *au pied de la lettre*, is united to a vivid preoccupation with the æsthetic beauty of the image itself, the *figured* side of figurative expression, the *form* of the metaphor. When it is said, "Out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword," it deals directly and boldly with that difficult image, like that old designer of the fourteenth century, who has depicted this, and other images of the Apocalypse, in a glorious coloured window at Bourges. It cares a great deal for the hair of *Temperance*, discreetly bound, for some subtler likeness to the colour of the sky in the girdle of *Hope*, for the inwoven flames in the red garment of *Charity*. And what was specially peculiar to the temper of Giotto, to the temper of his age in general, doubtless, more than to that of ours, was the persistent and universal mood of the age in which the story of Demeter and Persephone was first created. If some painter of our own time has conceived the image

of *The Day* so intensely that we hardly think of distinguishing between the image, with its girdle of dissolving morning mist, and the meaning of the image; if William Blake, to our so great delight, makes the morning stars literally "sing together"—these fruits of individual genius are in part also a "survival" from a different age, with the whole mood of which this mode of expression was more congruous than it is with ours. But there are traces of the old temper in the man of to-day also; and through these we can understand that earlier time—a very poetical time, with the more highly gifted peoples, in which every impression men received of the action of powers without or within them suggested to them the presence of a soul or will, like their own, a person, with a living spirit, and senses, and hands, and feet; which when it talked of the return of Kore to Demeter, or the marriage of Zeus and Hera, was not using rhetorical language, but yielding to a real illusion, to which the voice of man "was really a stream, beauty an effluence, death a mist."

The gods of Greek mythology overlap each other; they are confused or connected with each other, lightly or deeply, as the case may be, and sometimes have their doubles, at first sight as in a confused dream, yet never, when we examine each detail more closely, without a certain truth to human reason. It is only in a limited sense that it is possible to lift, and examine by itself, one thread of the network of story and imagery, which in a certain age of civilisation wove itself over every detail of life and thought, over every name in the past, and almost every place in Greece. The story of Demeter then was the work of no single author or place or time; the poet of this, its first phase, was no single person, but the whole consciousness of an age, though an age doubtless with its differences of more or less imaginative individual minds, with one here or there eminent, though but by a little, above a merely receptive majority, the spokesman of a universal, though faintly-felt prepossession, attaching the errant fancies of the people around him to definite names and images. The myth grew up gradually, and at many distant places, in many minds, independent of each other, but dealing in a common temper with certain elements and aspects of the natural world, as one here, and another there, seemed to catch in that incident or detail, which flashed more incisively than others on the inward eye, some influence, or feature, or characteristic of the great mother. The various epithets of Demeter, the local variations of her story, its incompatible incidents, bear witness to the manner of its generation. They illustrate that indefiniteness which is characteristic of Greek mythology, a theology with no central authority, no link on time, liable from the first to an unnoticed transformation. They indicate the various, far-distant spots from which the visible body of

the goddess slowly collected its constituents, and came at last to have a well-defined existence in the popular mind. In this sense, Demeter appears to one in her anger, sullenly withholding the fruits of the earth, to another in her pride of Persephone, to another in her grateful gift of the arts of agriculture to man; at last only, is there a general recognition of a clearly-arrested outline, a tangible embodiment, which has solidified itself in the imagination of the people, they know not how.

The worship of Demeter belongs to that older religion, nearer to the earth, which some have thought they could discern behind the more definitely national mythology of Homer. She is the goddess of dark caves, and is not wholly free from monstrous form. She gave men the first fig in one place, the first poppy in another; in another, she first taught the old Titans to mow. She is the mother of the vine also; and the assumed name, by which she called herself in her wanderings, is *Dós*, a gift; the crane, as the harbinger of rain, is her messenger among the birds. She knows the magic powers of certain plants, cut from her bosom, to bane or bless; and, under one of her epithets, herself presides over the springs, as also coming from the secret places of the earth. She is the goddess then of the fertility of the earth, in its wildness; and so far her attributes are to some degree confused with those of the Thessalian *Gaia* and the Phrygian *Cybele*. Afterwards, and it is now that her most characteristic attributes begin to concentrate themselves, she separates herself from these confused relationships, as specially the goddess of agriculture, of the fertility of the earth as furthered by human skill. She is the preserver of the seed sown in hope, under many epithets derived from the incidents of vegetation, as the simple countryman names her, out of a mind full of the various experiences of his little garden or farm. She is the most definite embodiment of all those fluctuating mystical instincts, of which *Gaia*, the mother of the earth's gloomier offspring,¹ is a vaguer and mistier one. There is nothing of the confused outline, the mere shadowiness of mystical dreaming, in this most concrete human figure. No nation, less aesthetically gifted than the Greeks, could have so lightly thrown its mystical surmise and divination into images so clear and idyllic as those of the solemn goddess of the country, in whom the characteristics of the mother are expressed with so much tenderness, and the "beauteous head" of *Kore*, then so fresh and peaceful.

In this phase, then, the story of Demeter appears as the peculiar creation of country-people of a high impressibility, dreaming over

* (1) In the Homeric hymn, pre-eminently, of the flower which grew up for the first time, to snare the footsteps of *Kore*, the fair but deadly *Narcissus*, the flower of *νάρκη*, the numbness of death.

their work in spring or autumn, half consciously touched by a sense of its sacredness, and a sort of mystery about it. For there is much in the life of the farm everywhere which gives, to persons of any seriousness of disposition, special opportunity for grave and gentle thoughts. The temper of people engaged in the occupations of country life, so permanent, so "near to nature," is at all times alike; and the habitual solemnity of thought and expression which Wordsworth found in the peasants of Cumberland, and François Millet in the peasants of Brittany, may well have had its prototype in early Greece. And so, even before the development by the poets of their awful and passionate story, Demeter and Persephone seem to have been pre-eminently the *venerable* or *awful* goddesses. Demeter haunts the fields in spring, when the young lambs are dropped; she visits the barns in autumn; she takes part in mowing and binding up the corn, and is the goddess of sheaves. She presides over all the pleasant, significant details of the farm, the threshing-floor and the full granary, and stands beside the woman baking bread at the oven. With these fancies are connected certain simple rites; the half-understood local observance, and the half-believed local legend, reacting capriciously on each other. They leave her a fragment of bread and a morsel of meat, at the cross-roads, to take on her journey; and perhaps some real Demeter carries them away, as she wanders through the country. The incidents of their yearly labour become to them acts of worship; they seek her blessing through many expressive names, and almost catch sight of her at dawn or evening in the nooks of the fragrant fields. All the picturesque implements of country life are hers; the poppy also, emblem of an inexhaustible fertility, and full of mysterious juices for the alleviation of pain. The countrywoman who puts her child to sleep in the great, cradle-like basket for winnowing the corn, remembers Demeter *Curotrophos*, the mother of corn and children alike, and makes it a little coat out of the dress worn by its father at his initiation into her mysteries. Yet she is an angry goddess too sometimes, Demeter *Erinnys*, the goblin of the neighbourhood, haunting its shadowy places. She lies on the ground out of doors on summer nights, and becomes wet with the dew. She grows young again every spring, yet is of great age, the wrinkled woman of the Homeric hymn, who becomes the nurse of Demophoon. Other lighter, errant stories nest themselves, as time goes on, within the greater. The water-newt, which repels the lips of the traveller who stoops to drink, is Ascalaphus, who spoiled by his mockery the pleasure of the goddess, as she drank once of a wayside spring in her wanderings. The night-owl is the transformed Ascalabus, who alone had seen Persephone eat the morsel of pomegranate in the garden of

Aidoneus. The bitter wild mint was once a girl, who for a moment had made her jealous in Hades.

But the house of the prudent countryman is a place of honest manners; and Demeter *Thesmophoros* is the guardian of married life, the deity of the discretion of wives. She is therefore the founder of civilised order. The peaceful homes of men, scattered about the land, in their security—Demeter represents these fruits of the earth also, not without a suggestion of the white cities, which shine upon the hills above the waving fields of corn, seats of justice and of true kingship. She is also in a certain sense the patron of travellers, having, in her long wanderings after Persephone, recorded and handed down those omens caught from little things—the birds which crossed her path, the persons who met her on the way, the words they said, the things they carried in their hands—by noting which, men bring their journeys to a successful end; so that the simple countryman may pass securely on his way, and is led by signs from the goddess herself, when he travels far to see her at Hermione or Eleusis.

So far the attributes of Demeter and Kore are similar. In the mythical conception, as in the religious acts connected with it, the mother and the daughter are almost interchangeable: they are the *two* goddesses, the twin-named. Gradually Persephone defines herself; functions distinct from those of Demeter are attributed to her. Hitherto, always at the side of Demeter and sharing her worship, she now appears detached from her, coming and going on her mysterious business. A third part of the year she abides in darkness; she comes up in the spring; and every autumn, when the countryman sows his seed in the earth, she descends thither again, and the world of the dead lies open, spring and autumn, to let her in and out. Persephone then is the summer-time, and a daughter of the earth in this sense; but the summer as bringing winter; the flowery splendour and consummated glory of the year, as thereafter immediately beginning to draw near to its end, as the first yellow leaf crosses it, in the first severer wind. She is the last day of spring, or the first day of autumn, in the threefold division of the Greek year. Her story is but the story, in an intenser form, of Adonis, of Hyacinth, of Adrastus, the king's blooming son, fated, in the story of Herodotus, to be wounded to death with an iron spear, of Linus, a fair child who is torn to pieces by hounds every spring-time, of the Sleeping Beauty. From being the goddess of summer and the flowers, she becomes the goddess of night and sleep and death, confusable with Hecate, the goddess of midnight terrors; *Kόρη ἄππρος*, the mother of the Erinnyes, who appeared to Pindar, to warn him of his approaching end, upbraiding him because he had made no hymn in her praise, which swan's song he thereupon

began, but finished with her. She is a twofold goddess, therefore, according as one or the other of these two contrasted aspects of her nature is seized respectively. A duality, an inherent opposition in the very conception of Persephone, runs all through her story, and is part of her ghostly power. There is ever something in her of a divided or ambiguous identity; hence the many euphemisms of later language concerning her.

The student of *origins*, of the earlier stages of art and poetry, must be content to follow faint traces; and in what has been here said, much may seem to have been made of little, with too much completion, by a general framework or setting, of what after all are but doubtful or fragmentary indications. Yet there is a certain cynicism too, in that over-positive temper, which is so jealous of our catching any resemblance in the earlier world to the thoughts that really occupy our own minds, and which, in its estimate of the actual fragments of antiquity, is content to find no seal of human intelligence upon them. Slight indeed in themselves, these fragmentary indications become suggestive of much, when viewed in the light of such general evidence about the human imagination as is afforded by the theory of "comparative mythology," or what is called the theory of "animism." Only, in the application of these theories, the critic must never forget that after all it is with poetry that he has to do. As regards this story of Demeter and Persephone, what we actually possess is some actual fragments of poetry, some actual fragments of sculpture; and with a curiosity, justified by the direct æsthetic beauty of these fragments, we feel our way backwards to that engaging picture of the poet-people, with which the ingenuity of modern theory has filled the void in our knowledge. The abstract poet of that first period of mythology, creating in this wholly impersonal, intensely spiritual way—the abstract spirit of poetry itself, rises before the mind; and, in speaking of this poetical age, the critic must take heed, before all things, not to offend the poets.

WALTER H. PATER.

(To be concluded in the next number.)

A GLIMPSE OF THE KOREA.

A cool breeze from the north-west rose in the early morning, and fanned the heated waters of the Korean Channel, raised yesterday almost to a glow by the scorching blaze of the August sun. The atmosphere is still clear of vapour; the sky above, the sea beneath, both serenely blue; a gentle ripple just ruffles the surface of the water, tossed into spray only by the cleaving prow of the huge ship steaming onward towards the land; light fleecy clouds, snowy or even silvery white in the early sunshine, flock the bright azure of the sky, and float across the newly-risen sun. Far away on the port bow a long line of misty cloud-masses hangs over the lofty summits of the Korean island of Quel-part, itself still out of view. On the starboard hand rise above the horizon, indistinct in the far distance, the blue ridges of the mainland, with an archipelago of fantastic rocks and cone-shaped islets for foreground. Ahead show out the bold cliffs and steep inclines of the curious double island known to Western navigators as Port Hamilton, for which the ship is bound. A deep cleft in the lofty side soon widens to an opening; the opening becomes a "narrow;" and close to the island promontory on the left—for the shore is bold and deep water flows beside it—the ship glides into the placid bay between the two curving islands which, like arms, embrace and form it. A few small fishing-craft were standing into the bay, their white or pale-blue pennons fluttering in the gentle breeze from slender staves erected in their high-pitched sterns.

The slow progress towards the anchoring ground gave time for a good look round on the shores of the quiet bay. On either hand hills rose, here abruptly, there with gentle slope, to a height of at least five hundred feet; whilst above the general line of heights sharp-pointed peaks sprang to an elevation half as great again. The slopes were richly green: green with fields of waving millet still unripe. Cultivation reigned on every available spot. From beach to summit, save where excessive steepness forbids labour, the whole hillside was divided into cultivated fields, separated from each other by green hedgerows as in some far Western lands. Every scrap of ground was in crop, not a single plot was even fallow. Above, or on steep promontories, or edging the narrow strip of soil between the rocky beach and the cliffs that here and there vary the outline of the shore, grow clumps of evergreen oaks, or copses of fir and pine. The fields were small, and the thick foliage of the dividing hedges looked at a distance like a bank of green. The contour of the land, the size and fashion of the fields, the moist verdure of the slopes, recalled to more than one of us, by whom the place was now visited for the first time, the green landscapes of southern Ireland.

In a fold of the hillside between two gentle ascents, half-way toward the summit of the ridge of Sodo, the westernmost island of the two, peered out from amidst fields and hedgerows, the scattered roofs of a small hamlet. Elsewhere the population is gathered into four large villages or towns—two on the western, and two on the eastern island. The chief town lies toward the north on the western shore of the bay, where the island dips to a long promontory crowned at the point with such a headland as Misenum. Across the dip between the central ridge and this elevated headland lie the blue mountains of the distant main. Beyond the cape, and between it and the western shore, runs a narrow strait, shallow, and with sunken rocks which make the little sound between the islands almost land-locked. The town is compactly built; hip-roofs of poles and mat, with sloping ends, lie close together. In the distance they called to mind the likeness of a *testudo* of besieging shields. The town abuts upon the stony beach. Each house and its dependent buildings are surrounded by a rude stone wall. Above the coping shoot branches of green shrubs, and here and there stems of the universal millet. Between the house walls run rudely-paved lands as steep and stony as at Brixham or Clovelly. A few boats were hauled upon the beach, and a coasting craft of some thirty tons rode at anchor hard by. The town itself contains close on two hundred and fifty houses, and possibly a thousand souls.

On the other island, also on the beach, but where the water makes almost an inlet in the shore, are two other towns. Both seemed large—as large at least as the one just noticed on Sodo. In front of the southernmost lay many junks at anchor. From both—but not from a single house of either town on the other island—wreaths of blue smoke rose. The more northern climbs somewhat high up the hill, and yet higher throws out a scanty suburb. The fourth town was passed and soon hidden behind a jutting headland: it is perhaps the smallest of the four.

In front of each stands a stately tree; beneath its shade, on a platform rudely faced with loose stones, the elders and the commons of the little communities assemble. At first, as we entered the bay, scarce a soul was stirring. A few men and boys were seen moving about in front of some of the houses, or perhaps along a lane between the hedgerows. But as the morning advanced, many peeped out from their doors, till before long a crowd was gathered before each little town to look at the ship moving slowly up the bay. The anchor was cast opposite the town first mentioned. Within a short time of anchoring, a boat put off from the ship for the shore, to make some inquiries of the head-man, or governor of the island. The emissary was received at the water's edge, and courteously conducted to the great tree, the shade cast by which was supplemented by that of a canvas awning spread for the purpose. The officer was received

by the chief men of the place, each distinguished—besides the stature and bearing of a higher class—by an official head-dress. This head-gear is black, made of some light fibrous substance, as finely woven as a horsehair sieve, and in shape much resembling that of the peasant women of South Wales, the heroines of Fishguard. The cavity to receive the head is cup-shaped; and beneath the brim. The common robe of all is white, long and flowing like the Japanese *kimono*, and girt in at the waist. Loose broad trousers of the same are tied in below the knee; white socks or buskins, and pointed, turned-up shoes complete the costume. The hair is long, and is gathered up into a small knot upon the crown. The children wear it in a long plaited tail behind; perhaps a remnant of the Manchu tyranny which tried, and failed in the attempt, to put upon the Koreans the same head-mark as that submitted to by the more pliable Chinese.

In the little embassy from the ship there was no one who could speak the Korean tongue. Communication was held by the aid of a Chinese servant, who wrote the few questions asked in the characters of his language. Question and answer were written upon paper, and readily interpreted by both Korean and Chinese, though neither could speak one word of the other's tongue. The head-men would not allow the baser sort, of whom a small crowd had already collected, to approach too near. Those who did were waved back, and when signs and orders failed, were beaten backwards with bamboos. The village senate—for such seemed the group of elders who surrounded the venerable head-man—were unarmed, and no member bore even a staff of office.

The not important information asked for being courteously imparted, the boat returned on board. Soon as the bell struck eight the colours were hoisted in accordance with ancient naval custom, and the band played "God save the Queen!" The notes of the music floated across the bay, and the crowds of gazers at the different villages quickly increased. An hour afterwards a boat again pulled in towards the beach, this time carrying a goodly load of visitors. On landing, as before, two grave inhabitants, adorned with the official head-dress, met the visitors and conducted them to the meeting-place beneath the tree. The senate was assembled to receive them. Again the general public was kept at a respectful distance, and by the same argument as before. The aged head-man was courteous, and hospitable withal. An attendant brought forth some native liquor, which was poured into a broad-mouthed, shallow cup of metal, first tasted by the venerable host—such is the Korean mode—and then handed to the visitors. The liquor, whitish in colour and sour in taste, is possibly akin to the *koumis* of the Tartar tribes. The visit of strangers was evidently not much liked. Still the elders showed a certain grave courtesy, and a somewhat

pleasing and even well-bred manner. As the officers from the ship divided into small parties of three and four to explore the island, some slight show of opposition was made. This was overcome, or purposely let pass unnoticed; so two of the little senate accompanied each party. The strangers being young, and eager for exercise after their confinement on board, pushed out quickly for the hills. Inspection of the town was firmly resisted, and with almost complete success; so roads had to be taken to the right and left. Hurrying after the eager visitors could be seen, from the deck of the ship, the two attending villagers in their high-crowned hats and flowing robes; now lagging half-tired out behind, now trotting courageously to regain the party in front, now eagerly waving the fan which all carry, now fluttering it rapidly to cool themselves, for the sun was already high, and the thermometer, even afloat, showed 87° in the shade. When signs had no effect, the visitors were hailed "Chin-chin," the universal salutation on the China coast, believed by the English to be Chinese, and by the Chinese to be English; though in reality it belongs to neither speech. Probably, however, the use of the phrase now is a remnant of former intercourse with Chinese.

Some did actually succeed in traversing the village, and even in seeing the inside of a Korean house. Not a woman was visible; all had been carefully hidden away. The houses are built of wood, with sliding doors and windows, like those of the Japanese. In the front, about the centre, is a recess or open-sided chamber, for reposing in during the summer heats. At one end is a low balcony or verandah, formed by the protruding eaves. A light railing runs round it, and a cool resting-place is thus made. The house-floor is a raised platform, as in Japan, a small portion of which is cut away just within the door, to form a cavity in which, on entering, the shoes or sandals are deposited. The only domestic animals seen were pigs—probably of the Chinese breed—and dogs. In the fields, singly, and in some places in twos and threes, were numerous rounded cones, with a sharp pointed thatch upon the roof, which look like huts, but were found to be small granaries for the millet when harvested. At the northern end of the chief village these stood so thick as to bear the semblance of an Indian town.

Two of the island senators who had accompanied one of the parties of officers who had landed, expressed a wish by signs to pay a visit to the ship. No persuasion could get them to go alone. The officers signified their assent to repeated requests to accompany them, and a native boat was launched to take them on board. This frail bark was worked by a man and two boys, who propelled it by a single scull, with the bent handle and straw lashing at the inner end, common in Northern China and Japan. The boat itself was of the rudest construction. The sides were fashioned of wide and roughly trimmed

planks hewn from some tree of great size. The ends protruded far beyond the stern, and across them, above the water, were laid rows of slender poles offering a fragile deck on which to stand. The passengers, as in the sampans of Amoy and the Straits, sit at the bow.

Arrived alongside the ship, the Korean visitors clambered up the side. On reaching the deck each bowed low, and said, "Chin-chin." One was a fine and even handsome man, six feet high at least, with Caucasian features and a copper-coloured skin. His mouth and chin were fringed with a scanty black beard. On his head was the official hat, buff white, not black, like all the others that had been seen. This, it is explained, shows that he is in mourning for his mother, white in the Korea, as in China, being the hue of mourning. The visitors at first showed evident signs of timidity; but, at the same time, were not without a certain amount of swagger, though good manners still held paramount sway. They yielded to invitation, which had to be more than once repeated, and went about the ship looking at the guns, the shot, and the various small arms. Invited to look into the muzzle of a huge twelve-ton piece, they politely and with even graceful gesture, declined. Expression and refusal said plainly, "A thousand thanks; I will assume for your sake that it is wonderful, as you evidently wish that I should." The taller one explained that he understood what the great gun was; he pointed to it, and shouted loudly, "Boom!" thus mimicking the roar of modern artillery. This was so favourably received that he attempted the same mode of expressing himself when shown the engines, and exclaimed, "Whoosh! Whoosh!"

Invited to descend to the deck on which the seamen mess, they again showed their diffident manner. The sight of Chinese cooks, however, at the cooking galley seemed to be reassuring; and the strangers proceeded to inspection. As in China, so in the Korea, *nil admirari*, or at least the repression of outward symptoms of admiration, is regarded as essential to good manners. The two strangers tried hard, and for some time successfully, to restrain their feelings. These at last got the better of them. Shown into the ward-room, a well-lighted, and—for a ship at least—a lofty apartment, hung with brightly coloured pictures, and adorned with gilded mouldings, they expressed their admiration loudly in a spontaneous outburst of delight. The taller visitor forgot his mourning, clapped his hands loudly upon the table, inclined his head towards a gorgeous chromo-lithograph, and broke out into a song of joyous delight. Calling for the interpreting paper and pencil, he wrote in rapid but well-formed characters the assertion that all was perfect. Then both he and his friend seated themselves and relapsed into placid admiration and well-bred ease. Above their heads hung a portrait of Queen Victoria. It was explained to them who the august personage was; both rose, stood in front of it, and made it low and reverent obeisance.

The gestures were the same as those that still linger in Japan, in spite of the hot haste in adopting Western customs.

Hospitality was thrust upon them in the English manner by the offer of the national beverage. They expected their hosts to taste first, and then they themselves took long sips of the ale. The glasses were put down, and no sign of pleasure or of disgust appeared upon the face of either; but, after a decent interval, the tall Korean called again for paper and pencil, and this time wrote a request that the pale-ale—not, it is true, improved by a voyage half round the world—might be given to his low-born countrymen who worked the boat in which he came on board. After this he was tried with a sweet, highly-flavoured liqueur. Of this both he and his companion altogether approved, and no pressure was needed to induce them to accept a second glass. Opposite to where they sat was a large mirror. Catching sight of the reflections of their faces in this, they rose and stood immediately in front of it, rectifying meantime defects in their toilet.

The tall visitor, who took the lead in all matters, asked in writing if the band, the strains of which he had probably heard in the morning, might be ordered to play. His request was complied with, and soon the stirring sounds of the march of the Presbrajenski Regiment penetrated to the ward-room. The effect was instantaneous and strange. The shorter islander, who seemed older than his companion, and who had a grave and reverent aspect, suddenly brightened up; then, extending his arms horizontally, threw back his head, and began a slow dance in unison with the music. He was evidently sublimely unaware of the strange grotesqueness of his combined levity and solemnity of appearance. The dance was kept up for a minute or two, and reminded one of the strange devotional exercise of the dervishes of Galata. The younger visitor was less moved, but he, too, permitted the effects of the pleasure of the sensation to be distinctly perceived. At length, it was explained to them that they must leave, as the ship was about to sail. They civilly said "farewell," or what seems to be such, and getting into their crazy-looking boat, were sculled towards the shore.

Few on board her failed to regret that they had not been able to see more of this strange people, which has, more consistently and successfully than either Chinese or Japanese, resisted all attempts at intercourse on the part of foreigners. Four years ago, the Americans, who tried to gain access to the country, with a result different from that which followed Commodore Perry's mission to Japan, were led into a conflict with the Koreans, and having undertaken an expedition with insufficient force, were repulsed. Since then, no attempt on the part of a Western nation to penetrate the mysterious exclusiveness of the Korea has been made. Less is known of the country and of the people than of the man-

ners and customs of many savage tribes. What their religion is, is doubtful; and even within a few hundred miles of their shores two totally different accounts of their system of government and polity are given. One authority declares them to be citizens of a republic; another, the despotically governed subjects of an autocratic ruler. At Port Hamilton no temple nor sign of worship (save perhaps veneration of ancestors, as in China and Japan) was visible. The village communities are governed evidently by a deliberative body; a senate either chosen by age, or a council of leaders selected as in ancient Germany, *ex nobilitate*. There are symptoms of the existence of an aristocracy of birth, or a superior class. Education is widely disseminated; most can write and understand the Chinese characters. Unlike their Japanese neighbours and—if the theory of a Korean immigration into Japan in pre-historic times be accepted—probable descendants, they do not on ordinary occasions go armed. About them there hangs the interest inevitably begotten by mystery, and an interest which approaching events may intensify. The restless party in Japan, which has run such a headlong course on the path of Europeanisation, is said to purpose an attack upon the Koreans, simply to “keep in wind” the *Samurai*, the military class which the three or four years that have elapsed since the abolition of feudalism, have been insufficient to absorb. That some intention of the kind passes through the minds of the ruling clique in Japan, is tolerably certain. The native press, in discussing relations with the Korea, treat it as a matter of fact, and the only difference of opinion is as to the pretext. A prominent Japanese newspaper has very recently attributed the warlike aspirations of the hour to the machinations of the less reputable foreigners, who have, as a class, made so much out of the foibles and the innocent mistakes of the Japanese people. A writer in the journal in question infers that they desire to reap again such a harvest as fell to those occidentals who, in the golden age of Western commerce with Japan, enriched themselves by rather questionable transactions. “They probably desire,” hints a writer in this Japanese journal, “to buy worn-out vessels for next to nothing, and sell them to us at exorbitant prices.” It will be well if Japan pauses before being led into the dangers of a warlike policy. Going to war “with a light heart” is likely to produce as many ills in the far East as in the West. The imitators of Western manners in Japan know enough of recent history to be aware of the dangers that overtook a dynasty which, to satisfy the desires of a certain class of the population, declared war against a neighbour of unascertained strength with *un cœur léger*. May they profit by the example. The Korea is the last semi-civilised State which has resisted the attempts of foreigners to open intercourse with it. The days of Cortez and Pizarro are past; it will be a painful burlesque if their career be mimicked by Japan. CYPRIAN A. G. BRIDGE.

COURAGE AND DEATH.

"I dare do all that may become a man ;
Who dares do more, is none."—*Macbeth*.

ELEVEN years ago the question was raised in the presence of Mr. Mill as to whether the charge of personal cowardice, brought against Louis Napoleon by Victor Hugo and others, was refuted by the lamentable boldness which he showed on the occasion of the *coup d'état*. Mr. Mill's attention was called to a passage which I had seen in the writings, I think, of Louis Blanc, to the effect that Robespierre, though he had less personal courage than Danton, had more moral courage ; and it was asked whether Louis Napoleon might not, in this respect, have been like Robespierre. Mr. Mill recognised the importance of making the distinction between the two kinds of courage, and observed that the type of character which combines great physical courage with an utter want of moral courage is only too common. This remark of our great philosopher may serve as a text for a short comparison and contrast between the two forms of courage ; and for an inquiry how far physical fear, and how far what may be called moral fear, is a chief ingredient in the fear of death.

At the outset we are met by a difficulty in the use of terms, which is indicated in the motto prefixed to this article. Is moral courage necessarily laudable ? The courage of Lady Macbeth, like that which prompted the *coup d'état*, was atrociously immoral ; but it is difficult, without doing violence to language, to refuse, in a sense, to give the name of moral courage to the courage of those who "*fortem animum præstant rebus quas turpiter audent*," and whose "faith unfaithful keeps them falsely true." At any rate, their courage has reference to moral sanctions, and is a form of moral courage if moral courage is the only alternative to physical. It was this dubious kind of courage which Xenophanes disclaimed, when charged with cowardice for refusing to gamble : "Yes," he said, "I am the greatest coward in the world, for I dare not do what is wrong."¹ It is, however, plain

(1) This sort of cowardice was not the failing of a late dignitary of the Church, who was nicknamed "Presence of Mind," in consequence of a story told by himself. "A friend," he used to relate, "invited me to go out with him on the water. The sky was threatening, and I declined. At length he succeeded in persuading me, and we embarked. A squall came on, the boat lurched, and my friend fell overboard. Twice he sank, and twice he rose to the surface. He placed his hands on the prow, and endeavoured to climb in. There was great apprehension lest he should upset the boat. Providentially I had brought my umbrella with me. I had the presence of mind to strike him two or three hard blows over the knuckles. He let go his hold and sank. The boat righted itself, and we were saved."—*Edinburgh Review*, April, 1861.

that when Mr. Mill spoke of the rarity of moral courage, he used the term in a good sense; he lamented that all but a very few are willing to follow the multitude to do evil, or to abstain from doing good. Such, also, is the meaning that is nearly always attached to moral courage; and perhaps it would be hard to show more clearly what moral courage in this, its best, sense is, and how easily physical courage may exist without it, than in the well-known lament of Hamlet—

“Am I a coward?”
 Who calls me villain? breaks my pate across? . . .
 Why I should take it; for it cannot be.
 But I am pigeon-liver'd, and lack gall
 To make oppression bitter.”

This hybrid courage may be well illustrated by examples from actual life. But I must premise that what I call moral fear is often, if not always, a development from bodily fear. The schoolboy, in dread of his master's displeasure, knows of the possible application of the rod; and, in some cases, the distinction which I draw between moral and physical courage might be otherwise expressed as a distinction between a higher kind of physical courage and a lower. Having called attention to this vagueness of language, I will begin by giving a few instances, taken at random, of the common or Hamlet type of character, which possesses physical courage in excess of moral. An apologist of Governor Eyre wrote an account of the adventurous boldness which he had shown in early life; and asked triumphantly how such a man could be charged with cowardice. The answer was obvious, that, as Governor of Jamaica, he had not been wanting in what a soldier understands as courage, but that he lost his head in a panic. Mr. Hughes, in his kindly memoir of his brother, relates that this brother, though braver than himself in boyish sports, was more sensitive to ridicule.¹ The Scythians, says Herodotus, had a long and indecisive war with their revolted slaves. At last, one of the masters complained that they must lose, by the struggle, whether they fell themselves or killed those who belonged to them; and he proposed that they should arm themselves, not with swords, but with whips. The hint was taken; and, on seeing the old instrument of oppression, the slaves trembled, and submitted to their bonds.

We now pass on to an opposite and less familiar type of character,—that of remarkable men whose physical courage has, on important occasions, fallen short of what might have been expected; the shortcoming being often due to youth and inexperience. Turenne, being asked whether he was frightened at the beginning of a battle, said, “Yes, I sometimes feel great nervous excitement, but there are many subaltern officers and soldiers who feel none what-

(1) To put a very different case—almost every sane suicide has physical, without moral, courage.

ever!" Condé was much agitated in his first campaign. "My body trembles," he said, "with the actions my soul meditates!" Frederic the Great, at Molwitz, gave but little promise of ever becoming a soldier. It is reported of one of the ablest friends of Washington that, in his first battle, his nerves quite gave way, and that he had to be held to his post by two soldiers; it was as if the hero's legs tried to carry him off in spite of himself. It is obvious to remark that distinguished men, whose nerves have thus completely broken down, may thank their stars for being distinguished. Much is forgiven them for they did much service. Had they been common soldiers, they would have received as little indulgence for the automatic action of their feet, as the poor receive for the malady of kleptomania. There is, however, a special reason why allowance should be made for generals whose presence of mind has failed them. A private has only to shut his eyes to danger, and to confront it with that *chien de courage*, of which a great commander spoke with envious disparagement. But the skilled courage of a general is a virtue of a very different order. He must, as it were, have two selves. In deliberation, he must calculate the exact amount of danger to which he exposes his troops; and then, in action, the calculation must be erased from his mind. He must often say to himself, "Peace, peace," when he feels that there is no peace; and, by a sort of military faith, he must fight as seeing a safety which is invisible. It is true that Nelson exclaimed, "What is fear? I never saw fear." But, at the time, Nelson was young; and against his remark may be set the saying of Charles V., when he saw written on a tombstone, "Here lies a man who never knew fear!" "Then," observed the emperor, "he can never have snuffed a candle with his fingers;" or, as we should say, such a man can never have felt the first touch of the forceps of a dentist. Charles V., no doubt, spoke from a commander's point of view; and he may, like other commanders, have felt the difficulty of emulating the happy fearlessness of his soldiers. By eating of the tree of knowledge, a general loses the military virtue in its intuitive and unconscious form.¹

In the above examples, the timidity shown by great men is admitted to have been a serious defect, however readily explained; but this is hardly so true in the case of those who may roughly be

(1) It is possibly owing to there being such various forms and aspects of courage that philosophers differ so much in their estimate of it. Lord Bacon, perhaps on the principle of damning sins or virtues he had no mind to, depreciated boldness, and described it as "a child of ignorance and baseness." Aristotle, on the other hand, set courage on a pedestal, and specially distinguished it from the counterfeit form of it which comes from ignorance. Johnson went yet further, and maintained that "courage is reckoned the greatest of all virtues, because, unless a man has that virtue, he has no security for preserving any other;" which is like saying that the watchdog is the most august member of the household, because necessary to the safety of the other members.

called artists, including under that term poets and orators. In estimating the "fears of the brave and follies of the wise," as shown by artists, it is scarcely too much to say that their fear is an element in their bravery, and that their folly is bound up with their wisdom. That courage should ever rest on a basis of fear seems at first sight a paradox, but to the readers of *Romola* the difficulty should not seem insuperable. Savonarola was a man of heroic moral courage; yet George Eliot admits that he was remarkably ready, under torture, to confess whatever his tormentors chose. His biographers bring his timidity into a yet stronger light by pointing out that his courage failed him in the presence of infectious disease; and that his persecutors, in applying the torture which so utterly unmanned him, seem to have followed the plan which long afterwards was *naively* recommended by Burleigh, and to have applied it "as mercifully as such a thing might be." No doubt it is easy to exaggerate the proofs of moral courage which the reformer gave. His eloquence was a powerful conductor of such courage, and one is tempted to credit him with the sum total of the courage which he inspired; but, first, we have no reason to suppose that he was as enormously superior to the mass of men in moral courage as in the power of imparting that courage; and, secondly, his hearers, in their enthusiasm, failed to realise the risk they ran, so that the courage they derived from him was not of the highest kind, but was rather the courage of excitement, if not of ignorance. Still, after all such deductions have been made, Savonarola's courage was very great; and we are naturally surprised that a man of his aggressive boldness should have so shrunk from tasting the natural, though bitter, fruit of that boldness. The common solution of this mystery is probably right, so far as it goes: his nervous organization was unusually sensitive to pain.

We are thus led to ask, Are artists, and especially orators, peculiarly liable to the sensation of pain and to fear? and, if so, why? It is clearly impossible, in a short article, to answer these questions satisfactorily; but a few facts may not be out of place. Peel is believed to have owed his death to being unable to bear an operation which a less sensitive man might have borne. An eminent operator described Bishop Wilberforce as "a bundle of nerves," and as the most sensitive patient he had known. Sheridan was, I think, also very sensitive. It would be easy to bring forward more instances to show that, granting

"That there was never yet philosopher
That could endure the toothache patiently,"

there was hardly ever an orator but would endure it most impatiently. It would seem natural that, if artists are thus peculiarly sensitive to pain, they would be also peculiarly liable to the fear of

pain, and of what is likely to bring on pain. The case, however, is not very clear as to their want of military courage. For example, in the brightest period of Spanish history there were instances in which poetry and soldiering seemed to go together. Sir Philip Sidney is an obvious case on the same side. But other artists (in our sense of the term) have been less brave. "The divine power," says Plutarch, "gave Demosthenes and Cicero many similarities in their natural characters, such as their passion for distinction and their love of liberty in civil life, and their want of courage in danger and in war." Demosthenes was believed to have deserted his colours at Charoneia, and to have excused himself by saying "that he who flies may fight again."¹ There is at least no doubt that orators, as a rule, show a painful anxiety about their own speeches, and that toilsome uneasiness is a condition of their success. An eminent man told me that, when about to serve as junior to Follett in a great case, he congratulated his leader on the perfect composure which he must have acquired by long practice. Sir William merely asked my friend to feel his hand, which was "wet with anxiety;" and my friend added that this is the sort of man most likely to succeed.² The late Lord Derby said that his principal speeches cost him two sleepless nights—one in which he was thinking what he should say, the other in which he was lamenting what he might have said better; and, in like manner, Cicero is said to have had a bad night before his speech *pro Murenâ*. Indeed, according to Plutarch, he "not only wanted courage in arms, but in his speaking also: he began timidly, and in many cases he scarcely left off trembling and shaking even when he got thoroughly into the current and substance of his speech." The fact is that of those who, in the most different times and circumstances, have achieved the highest eloquence—*eloquium ac famam Demosthenis aut Gladstonis*—almost all have paid the penalty of great nervous sensibility.

The same may, in some measure, be affirmed of other artists. We are all familiar with cases in which poets, under temporary excitement, have imparted a delight that must have contrasted utterly with their own habitual state of mind: for example, Cowper, when he wrote "John Gilpin," and Statius, who, *cum*

(1) *Baron's Apophthegms*.—Stories of this sort, however mythical, have a certain dramatic interest. If they do not show what a particular poet or orator did, they tend to show what, in the opinion of the myth-makers and myth-transmitters, poets and orators were likely to have done.

(2) Mr. Galton has a suggestive remark about some men, eminently distinguished in the Indian mutiny, but wholly undistinguished before and since. "They had the advantage of possessing too tough a fibre to be crushed by anxiety and physical misery, and, perhaps in consequence of that very toughness, they required a stimulus of the sharpest kind to goad them to all the exertions of which they were capable."

fregit subsellia versu, esurit. Victor Hugo commends what he calls the *trouble* of Shakespeare, and adds words to the effect: "C'est cela qui manque à Goethe, loué à tort pour son impassibilité qui est infériorité." So important is this *trouble* both to poets and to orators, that one is tempted to say of many of them, in Biblical phrase, that they are like the troubled sea which cannot rest; and that, though they often commune with their own hearts, they cannot possibly "be still." Not actors only, but all artists, find their great peril in what M. Taine calls *l'habitude de jouer avec les passions humaines*; and, in order to acquire and keep up this habit, they must have an abundance of passions wherewith to play.

Having said thus much, we have gone far towards answering our second question, *why* men of genius are so often thin-skinned? It is no mere quibble to say that their sensibility is accompanied by sensitiveness, and that, having so much "feeling" about them, they are particularly liable to feel pain. Nor, again, is it hard to see why fear is so often the beginning of wisdom and success. First, it is a moral anti-soporific. If "fear hath torment," torment at least keeps one awake. To take a comparison from tapestry, fear is the underside, or wrong side, of zeal. When a man longs to win, he fears and trembles to lose; and a great man often owes more than he suspects to that nervous self-dissatisfaction which he will not acknowledge even to himself, but which in fact raises his ideal, so that he is disposed to count a merely partial triumph as a total failure—*Nil actum credens, dum quid superesset agendum*. So much may be said of almost any great man. But we have further seen why, in the case of an artist, we must not look to find that laborious self-mastery which is needed for the highest kind of courage. Possibly even any great effort of self-control might be hurtful to the artist as such; for genius is of spontaneous growth, and is in danger of being bent out of shape. It is true that the poet is born, not made; but by much overtraining he might be unmade. The possession of strong emotions and passions is at once the necessity and the danger of an artist's life; they are the Pegasus which he has to ride, and to ride without being thrown off. The artistic mean in this respect may be illustrated by the extreme, the thinness of the partition between great wits and eccentricity or madness is shown by the number of great wits who break through the partition. They are, in fact, the Bellerophons who cannot hold their heavenly steed in. Hence it may not be irrelevant to call attention to the complaint of one great poet about the *genus irritabile vatum*; and to the confession of another, that

"We poets are, upon a poet's word,
Of all mankind the creatures most absurd."

Plutarch says that orators and sportsmen, whom he unequally yokes

together, are of all men the least capable of controlling their tempers. Lord Chatham was sometimes afraid to make a speech, lest he should lose his self-command, and betray State secrets. It is probably through this want of self-restraint and adaptiveness that the marriages of poets are often so unhappy. Nor are other artists—artists commonly so called—free from the characteristic failings of men of genius, as may be seen from the following case; let us, however, hope it is an extreme one. It is said of Giorgio Benda, the violinist, “that, after his wife had died in his arms, he rushed to the piano to express his grief, but soon becoming interested in the airs he was originating, he forgot both his grief and the cause of it so completely, that when his servant interrupted him to ask about communicating the recent event to the neighbours, Giorgio jumped up in a puzzle, and went to his wife’s room to consult her.”¹ The above causes may account for the comparatively early deaths to which, as statistics show, great artists are liable. It may be said of this short-lived class that their spiritual fire is too much for them, and that, like jelly on a hot plate, they waste away in continual agitation. At first sight, Lord Palmerston might seem a signal exception to the principles we have laid down. His relatives were struck by his insensibility to pain, and Sir Henry Holland has confirmed their testimony: “I have seen him, under a fit of gout which would have sent other men to their couches, continue his work of writing or reading on public business, almost without abatement, amidst the chaos of papers which covered the floor as well as the tables of his room.”² But, in truth, Lord Palmerston is no exception to our rule, or rather he is an exception that proves our rule. He was an able speaker; for so able a man, with so much practice in speaking, could hardly fail to be such. But an orator’s passion and self-forgetfulness were just what he had not. Indeed, his freedom from the oratorical vexation of spirit may have helped to enable him to continue prime minister of a great nation at an age unsurpassed except by Fleury, whose political longevity Lord Palmerston spoke of with a sort of envy, and who, with his fourscore years and nine, seems to have furnished another instance of life being lengthened by its burdens being borne easily.

(1) *Hereditary Genius*, p. 243. The opposition, amounting almost to incompatibility, between the Greek, or artistic, and the Roman, or self-disciplining, type of character is eloquently expressed by Mommsen. He sums up by saying that “it is only a pitiful narrow-mindedness that will object to the Athenian, that he did not know how to mould his state like the Fabii and the Valerii; or to the Roman, that he did not learn to carve like Phidias, and to write like Aristophanes.”

(2) A similar remark may, in some degree, be applied to the late Mr. Babbage. It might be an interesting matter for inquiry whether mathematicians, with their unexciting and, at the same time, engrossing study, may not, on the one hand, be less sensitive to pain than many men, and, on the other hand, more capable of distracting their minds during it.

It appears from what we have said that, in making moral estimates, it is often impossible to allow for extreme sensitiveness of whatever kind; for the quality cannot be tested. In regard to physical suffering, we have no *painometer*. A man's fortitude under given painful conditions is a function of two variables: it depends on the degree of his insensibility to pain, and also on his power of repressing the signs of pain. Even these two conditions of fortitude are sometimes hard to distinguish, as will be seen from the following examples. It is an admitted fact that men in the prime of life bear pain much better than either old men or young children. Yet one can hardly doubt that men in their prime are more sensitive than men whose faculties have been benumbed by age. But strong men have abundant resources on which to fall back, and a fund of animal spirits from which to draw in the intervals of pain. In fact, they have a set-off against their pain; and, for practical purposes, the difference between such a set-off against pain and an actual diminution of pain is almost as purely a matter of form and of statement as the difference between placing a quantity in *plus* on one side of an equation, and placing the same quantity in *minus* on the other side. The capriciousness of courage set forth in the motto, *Jactantius morient qui minus dolent*, may be further illustrated by a fact which I owe to the courtesy of an eminent physician who practised many years in Egypt. There is a class of Egyptian peasants who, having to submit to a small operation, make a most unseemly ado; but, if an arm or a leg has to be removed, they submit, without a murmur, to the will of God. Indeed, the anomaly of which we speak seems to have something very Egyptian about it. Psammetitus, the captive king of Egypt, remained passive when he saw his son led to execution by order of Cambyses; but, on seeing one of his servants dragged away among the captives, he smote his forehead and lamented. On being asked concerning his conduct, he replied that the lesser sorrow admitted of weeping, but that his grief for his son was too deep for tears.¹ Such a manner of keeping silence, even from good words when pain and grief are intense, seems to a European extreme and affected. But it is a familiar fact that, within reasonable limits, sorrow, like opium, acts in small quantities as a stimulant, in large quantities as a sedative: *Cura leres loquuntur, ingentes stupent*.² Indulgence, however, can be

(1) Herod. III. 14.

(2) A similar idea is expressed in the lines, *Et via vix tandem vocis laxata dolore est*; and also in a justly celebrated canto of *In Memoriam* (xix., "The Danube to the Severn gave, &c."). I remember being amused by a phrase which George Sand applies to an excellent, but unsympathetic, Englishman, who always blundered over giving advice: "Ce malheureux n'avait pas le don des larmes." This sentence hits off to a nicety what the author's countrymen think of our phlegmatic people. At any rate, we could not retaliate the charge.

granted to the stupor of grief, only when it is genuine; when the grief itself refuses to speak, not when it is ostentatiously silenced. And, on this account, some of us feel less sympathy with David, who refused to mourn for his son when mourning was of no avail, than with Solon, who, on a like occasion, being chid for weeping, answered, "I weep, *bécause* weeping is of no avail." Perhaps, indeed, it may be doubted whether giving vent to grief, mental or bodily, is not often of some use,—better, that is, than bottling it up. The late Professor Sedgwick, having dislocated his shoulder, was advised by his surgeon to call out when in pain, and on no account to act the hero. Epicurus not only permits, but urges his wise man to cry out in torments. Montaigne tells us that some physicians in his time regarded screaming as a relief to women in childbirth; and he goes on to assure us, at rather unnecessary length, that, if in pain himself, he should scream likewise. Such statements, however, must be understood with a reserve; and the commendation must be limited to expressions of grief as harmless as what the Roman poet has called *lachrymæ inanes*, and what the English poet has no less justly called *idle tears*. Other signs of sorrow cannot be approved. Bion, the sage, seeing a mourner pull out his hair, asked, "Does this man think baldness a remedy for grief?"

The Egyptian mode of courage, as we call it, suggests an Oriental peculiarity with which, since the Indian mutiny, every one is familiar. Natives of the East often show a remarkable composure in the presence or immediate prospect of a great calamity. I heard the other day a narrative of three sepoys, who were awaiting their execution with a plate of rice before each. Number 1 being dragged off before his meal was finished, Number 2 scooped the remains of it on to his own plate, and ate as fast as he could till the fatal summons interrupted him; whereupon Number 3 followed suit, and had just time, with unabated appetite, to get through his own portion as well as that last bequest of his two friends. Now, it is strange that such fortitude as this should be so one-sided. Mr. Charles Austin used to say that his great aim in life was "never to desire the unattainable, and never to regret the inevitable." This goal towards which he was laboriously plodding, the sepoys seemed to gain as it were by a leap; and one might have expected that, being so callous when death was certain, they would be bold and active when there was a chance of life. But the fact is, that they were in a manner too patient to be brave. The very perfection of their passive courage was a hindrance to their possession of active courage. So hard is it often to distinguish between incurable ills, and ills just not incurable, that persons who find resignation easy when there is no hope, are apt to extend their passiveness to the border-land, and to think of the will of God when

they might be striving for the good of men. We may illustrate our meaning by the converse proposition: the energetic courage of the most vigorous races is nearly allied to impatience. Mr. Mill has quoted the remark that, if anything goes wrong in politics, Frenchmen say, "Il faut de la patience;" while Englishmen cry out, "What a shame!"; and he adds, that the latter state of mind is the more conducive to success. Yet an Englishman is apt to carry his constitutional grumbling to the extreme of crying "Shame" where there is no shame, and where the highest wisdom would dictate submission.

The superiority of lower races in passive endurance is a phenomenon not perhaps limited to races of men. In *Quentin Durward*, some gipsies about to be executed are likened to "foxes, which, after all their wiles and artful attempts at escape are exhausted, die with a silent and sullen fortitude, which wolves and bears, the fiercer objects of the chase, do not exhibit." At any rate, some of the lower animals, especially insects, display a wonderful indifference to bodily maiming. We are all familiar with instances of bisected wasps which have gone on drinking, like Munchausen's horse; and with narratives of moths having pins in their bodies, which have yet contrived to get about and devour their more securely transfixed neighbours. But perhaps the most marvellous story of the kind is one of beneficent decapitation, and may recall what Juvenal says of Pompey, that his *servatum caput* was a misfortune to him. Colonel Pringle, it seems, could not keep dragon-flies alive in confinement more than a few days; so he bethought him of the plan of cutting off their heads. This ingenious method lengthened life about thirty-fold; for one of the *capite minores* lived four, another six months.¹ Whatever view we may take of this singular example of sanitary headlessness, it is certain that "the poor beetle that we tread upon" does not suffer anything approaching to the dying pang of a "giant," or even of a dog. It may have been natural that Shakespeare, writing when he did, should have thought otherwise; but humanitarians of the present day are less excusable for often holding language that involves the old error. It is, however, not my present purpose to enter on the delicate task, delicate especially for a Utilitarian and a Darwinian, of defending the rather sweeping prerogative which man claims, and must claim, in disposing of his cousins, the brutes. Perhaps it may be doubted whether the Utilitarian principle can be applied to those distant relatives quite so unreservedly as Mr. Mill wished to apply it.² I will merely remark that there have been

(1) *Encyclopædia Britannica*, III. 177, s. v. *Animal Kingdom*.

(2) "Dissertations and Discussions," II. 483: a very strong passage. After all, it is hard for the Utilitarian, or any other theory of morals, to bear the strain of the most

persons, merciful to the lower animals, who have *taken it out* by injustice to their fellows. "The Turks," says Bacon, "are a cruel people, who nevertheless are kind to beasts, and give alms to dogs and birds." And the murderer, Eugene Aram, is said to have removed worms from his path into a place of safety. A few instances of this kind should be commended to the notice of many excellent persons, who are alike indignant with even the more moderate advocates of vivisection and with the advocates of euthanasia—with those who reluctantly make a few guinea-pigs suffer for the good of science and mankind, and with those who object to their fellow-men being forced to suffer for the good of no one. Might not the torrent of philozoic wrath be profitably diverted towards certain field-sports which are morally hurtful to men, as well as physically hurtful to their victims; or towards the game of Polo, where *inmeritis franguntur crura caballis*?

Be this, however, as it may, there can be little doubt that the savage is, comparatively speaking, "like a beast with lower pleasures, like a beast with lower pains;" and that generally, among both beasts and men, the higher the organization, the greater is the sensitiveness. Hence it follows that the brutal punishments and deeds of violence, so prevalent in ancient times, must not be measured by the standard of modern suffering; for probably our forefathers were by nature less sensitive to pain than we are, and they certainly were far more inured to it. These considerations are yet more important in judging of the too frequent violence of the poor, who are remarkable for what they bear, as well as for what they inflict, and whose roughness may be associated with their toughness. Some of my readers may remember the anecdote of the wife who was advised by the clergyman to bear her husband's ill-treatment with patience, and to heap coals of fire on his head. When next her counsellor met her, he asked whether she had taken the hint. "No, sir," was the answer: "I thought of putting fire on my husband's head, but I tried boiling water."¹ On hearing this story, one is struck, not merely with amazement at the woman's stupidity, but also with the suspicion that her husband can hardly have been so bad after all, or she would not have been left, with

extreme cases. Suppose that some angel or fairy had made the offer that a single inhabitant of another planet, who would otherwise be painlessly annihilated, should be made happy *for ever*, on condition that all mankind, to be ultimately annihilated in any case, should be tortured for billions of years; it is plain that, in strict theory, an infinite amount of happiness, even if concentrated on an individual, should enormously outweigh any finite amount of misery. Yet, if such an offer had been virtuously accepted on behalf of the human race by any saint or sage—in other words, if he had loved his unseen neighbour as himself, and as his neighbour whom he had seen—would not the latter have thought him righteous overmuch?

(1) This incident was mentioned in the House of Commons in 1873, and, I believe, purports to be authentic.

bones unbroken, so quietly to announce her too warm reception of him. Possibly, however, the unpleasantness of such a bath would be less felt among the classes trained to hardship than among the rich.¹ At any rate, the poor have a wonderful way of making light of severe accidents, even when those accidents have just befallen them. Not long ago, a sawyer in Derbyshire was exhibiting his skill before his master, and had the misfortune to cut off his own hand; his first thought was to apologize for his awkwardness. This may pair with the story of the Roman soldier in Gaul, who, being publicly thanked by Cæsar for a dangerous service in reconnoitring the enemy's position, knelt down and begged forgiveness for having lost his shield in crossing a river. It must be admitted that such abject loyalty lies near the border of servility, and that, when shown by an educated man, it decidedly crosses that border. A French king paid one of his nobles the compliment of visiting him during his last illness. "Pardonnez moi, sire," said the dying courtier, "si je fais des grimaces; je suis dans mon agonie."

It has already been remarked, how various is the estimate, and how mean was Bacon's estimate, of courage. A yet lower value was set on it by Rochester in his well-known saying, that "every man would be a coward if he durst." According to this view, a general, exhorting his soldiers to be brave, is a sort of homœopathist, who cures like by like, and who can only remedy the lack of physical courage by means of the lack of moral courage:—

"Still heaping on the fear of ill,
The fear of men,—a coward still."

Rochester's disparagement of courage may have arisen from his own courage having, at one time, been under a cloud. Yet in his cynical epigram there lies some measure of truth. Divested of exaggeration, and somewhat expanded, his thought may be expressed thus:—military courage, like other virtues, is in great measure maintained and directed by public opinion; but it is sometimes right to be caustic when public opinion is opposed to caution: hence will arise cases in which great moral courage may incur the reproach of cowardice; and, on the other hand, cases in which a display of physical courage may denote a want of moral courage. The first class of these cases was illustrated by the great Fabius, who was upbraided by his soldiers for wisely refusing to meet

(1) Bacon gives examples of extreme indifference both to heat and to cold. The Indians, "I mean the sect of their wise men, lay themselves upon a stack of wood, and so sacrifice themselves by fire." The opposite case is less familiar. "There be monks in Russia, for penance, that will sit a whole night in a vessel of water till they be engaged with hard ice." Last autumn, in an Alpine hotel, I met a veteran hydro-pathist who derived comfort from bathing every morning in an almost freezing lake, and who rolled, in a state of nature, on the snowy mountains above.

Hannibal in the field. The second class may have been exemplified in the Balaklava charge, of which the French general said, *C'est magnifique, mais ce n'est pas la guerre*. If this criticism was just, the magnificence was akin to the *splendide mendax*, and wisdom would have preferred something homelier. Here, then, moral courage should have been the moderator of physical courage. Our meaning may be made yet plainer by adverting to the fear of assassination. A great philosopher has observed that it is by sudden and uncertain perils that our presence of mind is most sorely tried; for they admit of no preparation, and, in order to withstand them, our courage must have become a second nature. This is why the fear of assassination has so often thrown brave men off their balance. It acts in two opposite ways. On the one hand, many men, such as Cromwell and Gentz, have been made by it moody and suspicious. But, on the other hand, this fear often simulates rashness, and drives people into a fatalistic indifference. It is as if they could only avoid thinking of the overhanging sword too much, by refusing to think of it at all. Cæsar, unwisely, as the event showed, neglected all precaution for his safety, on the ground that "he had rather suffer death once than always live in fear of it."¹ In like manner, Queen Elizabeth, when advised to have a guard, declared that she "had rather be dead than put in custody." Wellington used similar language to Lady Aldborough, who, during the occupation of Paris, remonstrated with him for risking his life in the French theatres. But the most fallacious, because the most explicit, aphorism of the kind is attributed to Henry IV.; it assumes the imposing form of a dilemma, yet it involves a principle which might be extended to the omission of precautions against criminals of all sorts. "He who fears death," said the king, "will undertake nothing against me; he who despises his own life will always be master of mine." The answer is obvious, that mankind cannot be thus sharply divided into those who do fear death and those who do not. Suppose a given risk of failing, and a given risk of being executed, to be just short of what will daunt an average assassin: if either or both of these risks be much increased, almost every assassin will be deterred. Possibly, however, the passive attitude so often assumed by persons whose lives are threatened, on whatever ground they defend it, is often the result of a wise calculation. They may think that, in their own case, valour is the better part of discretion, and that the best chance of averting assassination is to defy it. If such is their principle, it resembles that of Van Amburgh, who, being asked what he should do if he met a lion in the desert, answered, "If I wished for certain death, I should turn and run away."² As Shakespeare says,

(1) Plutarch's *Lives*.

(2) Col. Higginson's "Outdoor Papers."

"To fly the boar, before the boar pursues,
Were to incense the boar to follow us."

The fear of assassination leads up to, and forms part of, a far wider subject, the fear of death. We have already referred to the question, how far, when this fear is excessive, physical courage, and how far moral courage, should be considered at fault. We will conclude with a few reflections on this matter, while utterly disclaiming the thought of treating it scientifically or exhaustively in a few pages.

In comparing the grounds for fearing death in ancient and in modern times, it may be said roughly that the physical terrors of death are constant, while the moral terrors are variable. Not, indeed, that the mere physical terrors have been, strictly speaking, unchanged. For it is probable that the ancients, being used to hardship and suffering, were less sensitive to the sting of death than we are. On the other hand, it is certain that the progress of medicine, including the use of anaesthetics, has done something towards extracting that sting, and will in time do much more. No doubt, our medical improvements often increase the immediate fear of death which is felt by the dying: if the dying suffered more, their minds would be distracted, and they would shrink less from the final relief. But, at any rate, those medical improvements tend to mitigate the apprehension which the mere pain of dying excites in the world at large. And it is enough for my purpose that this pain of dying can hardly be worse with us than it was with our forefathers; the balance, if balance there is, is probably in our favour.

Yet, strange to say, the entire terrors of death seem to be greater in our time than in that of the great classical writers. To prove this assertion would not be easy; but scholars will hardly dispute it. It is remarkable that Bacon, when maintaining the paradox that the fear of death is the weakest of emotions, chooses all his examples from among pagans. He mentions, among other instances, the dying jest of Vespasian: *Ut puto, Deus fio*. It would be unfair to judge of the ancient indifference to death from this exceptional utterance; just as, on the other hand, it would be unfair to judge of the modern alarm at death from the case of Johnson, who, when the surgeon made slight scarifications in his swollen leg, exclaimed, "Deeper! deeper! I want length of life; and you are afraid of giving me pain, which I do not value." Yet it is hard not to think that these opposite frames of mind exhibit the ancient and modern tendencies in regard to death, though they exhibit them "writ large." The best of the ancients knew, as we do not know, how to obey the maxim of the great poet of stoicism, and to take a negative view of death as the mere end of life, the goal in the course of nature; if infirm or suffering, they could even go the length of Dryden's rendering of that maxim—

"And count it nature's privilege to die."

Hence they managed to take death easily, through thinking of it as a matter of course, and thinking but little of it even thus; while with us, on the other hand, death is just what Byron called it—"the doom we dread, yet dwell upon;" and it is life which now dwindles into being the accident of our existence—*l'antichambre de la mort*,¹ or rather, *de l'éternité*. In truth, the ancients (or, more properly, the Greek and Roman free citizens), in seeking *fortem animum, mortis terrore carentem*, acted by anticipation on my friend's rule, not to regret the inevitable; and to this unregretfulness, this dislike of breaking their wings against the bars of their cage, they owed much of that light-hearted joyousness which formed a real side of their character, though a less important side than we are apt to think.²

It is observed by Lessing that, in comparing the views entertained by different ages or races concerning death, their art proves a safer guide than their literature. Perhaps we may explain the grounds of this judgment by saying that literature is able, and is therefore expected, to give a diorama of what it depicts, while art can give only a panorama. Thus, in describing death, writers, especially poets, have to ring the changes of ever-varying, yet monotonous, details concerning the divers modes and stages, and the unexhilarating appendages, of dying. On the other hand, a painter or sculptor is in the strictest manner bound to the unities of space and time. Thus, if he seeks to represent death in the abstract, he can only give a momentary and concentrated view of it. His representation must (so far as it goes) include everything, and yet must include nothing that needs to be explained; so that he must confine himself to the essential and constant features of death, as distinguished from those which are accidental, and which vary in individual cases. What, then, are the essential ideas of death that are embodied in ancient and in modern art? To this Lessing replies that ancient art generally symbolizes death by emblems of repose and insensibility—modern art by a skeleton. It is true that he deprecates and denounces this tendency of modern art. Being himself *on the side of the angels*, he would have agreed with Coleridge that a good man's

(1) Dumas.

(2) No passage in Herodotus strikes me as more impressive than the one (vi. 98) in which he says that, in the three generations which had just elapsed, more evils befel Greece than in the twenty generations before. He is speaking of the age of Miltiades, Themistocles, and Pericles—the very greatest, and, one would have thought, happiest age in the annals of the greatest and happiest nation of antiquity. Also, he himself seems to have been a happy man; happy certainly in this, that he was born and died just at the right time: he was a child when Greece became safe from Persia, and his long life closed before the fall of Athens. Yet this great and happy man, speaking of this great and seemingly happy age, could only describe it as eminently miserable. The fact is that he had a near view of the age, while we only see it "foreshortened in the tract of time." What is this historical perspective worth?

surest friends should be "himself, his Maker, and the angel Death." And as an angel rather than as a skeleton, he would fain have seen death typified. Still, in dealing with things, not as he wished them to be, but as they are, he emphatically declares that ancient art and ancient thought represented death more favourably than modern art or modern thought. Hence it appears that his authority in this matter, being given with reluctance, should carry all the more weight, and that this authority is distinctly on the side of the view for which we have been contending.

Assuming, then, that the entire terrors of death have increased, while its physical terrors have, if anything, diminished, what has increased must be the aggregate of its non-physical, or, as we call them, its moral terrors. What, let us ask, is the nature of these moral terrors? Some of them are of minor importance, being indeed little more than a reflection of the physical terrors. Thus, Mr. Mill at one time condemned capital punishments on the ground that, by connecting death with crimes, they add an imaginary to the natural horror of it; much as King John, apologizing to Hubert for unflinching comments, improved matters by explaining that a suspicion of murder had "presented thee more hideous than thou art." Probably, however, we should be on our guard against expecting (in later life Mr. Mill would hardly have expected) men's nerves to be much strengthened by any mere mechanical reform like the one I have mentioned. Yet there is at least one such reform which might do some good in this direction: the aspect of death might be a little softened, if cemeteries gave place to *crematories*, and our minds were relieved from the revolting associations of the grave. If cremation has such a tendency, some of the ancients had, in this respect, less inducement to fear death than we have. Also, it may be contended that, if the ancients had little fear of the end of life, this may have been partly because they set little value on the beginning or middle of it,—the difference between them and us being, not that they dreaded death less, but that we love life more. This remark may have some application to Orientals, both present and past: as, for instance, we may gather from the gloomy view of life expressed in the Davidian hymns. But the explanation can scarcely be extended to the free citizens of the great classical nations; for, granting that, in spite of appearances, our life is happier and brighter than theirs was, it certainly cannot be so much happier and brighter as to set in appreciably greater contrast the dark colours of death. Moreover, some Orientals must have had a special reason to fear dying, particularly the Buddhists, whose posthumous ideal for the best of us is, that we must, through much tribulation and many transmigrations, enter into the land of nothingness. Yet Buddhism is not the only or the chief religion which, through the *post mortem* mystery, has the effect of attaching men to life.

Christian charity, it is true, has done much to make the domestic ties tender and sacred; and this is one reason why we shrink so much from dying, and leaving those who will grieve for us. But Christian charity is not the only cause of our so recoiling from the separation. It might have been thought that the Christian faith, by declaring the parting not to be final, would do as much to mitigate its pang as Christian charity could do to embitter that pang; yet, in fact, Christian faith and Christian charity seem to combine to embitter it. The pain of the final parting, as felt by Christians, is partly due to the deep solemnity which Christian sentiment attaches to death; and this solemnity is not unconnected with a vague sense of dismay at the tremendous uncertainty as to what our dying friends will see and feel when their eyes are closed. In short, there is reason to think that it is "the dread of something after death" which now makes cowards of us all; and that, St. Paul notwithstanding, Christian mourners, as a rule, have sorrowed, not less than others who have no hope, but more than others who have no fear.¹

An objection to this view may be founded on the odd stories that one hears about the death-beds of infidels and heretics. But it is obvious to answer, first, that a modern freethinker, who, with great suffering, has "obtained this freedom," is not like a thinker who is "free-born." Those who (as Tennyson puts it), "after toil and storm, may seem to have reached a purer air," seldom shake off the effects of the less pure air and the fatigue; and they are apt, especially in their last hours, to be haunted by the impressions of their youth, and the beliefs of those around them. This tendency of dying persons was well indicated by Patru, when Bossuet visited him on his death-bed. "Monsieur," said Bossuet, "on vous a regardé jusqu'ici comme un esprit fort. Songez à détromper le public par des discours sincères et religieux." "Il est plus à propos," replied the dying man, "que je me taise; on ne parle en ses derniers moments que par faiblesse ou par vanité." The enervating effects of training up a child in the fear of hell are especially visible in the pupils of those austere Calvinists, from whose early influence it is so hard to release oneself, and who expect the kingdom of heaven to be about as populous as the principedom of Monaco. Secondly, the true account of a heretic's death-bed is often hard to obtain. Sometimes, as in the case of Voltaire, his enemies persuade others, and perhaps themselves, that

(1) Probably also the modern development of the primitive belief that, without shedding of blood, there is no remission, and the momentous results attributed to the death on Calvary, have helped to give a direction and an intensity to the Christian sentiment about death. Observe, too, that a moderately good pagan might hope to be moderately happy hereafter; whereas a moderately good Christian, or rather Protestant, is tottering between infinite extremes, without even purgatory to serve as a mean. The paths of two men, whose degrees of sinfulness differ by a hair's breadth, may diverge into torment and glory: *ille crucem pretium tulit, hic diadema.*

he actually felt what they expected him to feel, and his remorse is evolved out of their own consciousness; sometimes, on the other hand, they give a flippant version of his courage, and distort it in a cynical caricature. The latter cause may have helped to produce the stories about Rabelais. It is said that, when dying, he sent for his domino, with the words, "Beati qui in Domino moriuntur." When Cardinal du Bellay sent his page to inquire after him, the dying man replied: "Tell your master the state you find me in; I am going in quest of a Great Pernaps. He is up in the jay's nest. Bid him keep where he is; and, for you, you will never be anything but a fool. Draw the curtain; the farce is ended."

In an old work by Deslandes, several instances are related which bear on this subject, and some of which closely resemble the anecdotes just given. It is there stated that Gassendi, in his last illness, exclaimed: "I know neither who placed me in the world, nor why I was placed in it, nor why I am taken from it;" and that the last words of Hobbes were: "I am going to take a great leap in the dark." Shortly before dying, the English sage exhibited his wit: after rejecting various epitaphs suggested by his friends, he said he should prefer the inscription, "This is the philosopher's stone." He thus almost realised beforehand the important part of the ideal of Charles Lamb, who hoped that his own last breath would be inhaled through a pipe, and exhaled in a pun. Sometimes a more or less witty flash of indignation is struck out of a dying man by the obtrusiveness of theological busybodies. A Frenchman in his last illness, being thus wearied by a priest, silenced his ghostly importuner with the promise: "Vous serez payé, mais laissez-moi en repos." The famous Grammont, shortly before he expired, received a visit from the Marquis de Dangeau, who was sent by the King to try and convert him. The dying man, though in agony, could not forbear twitting his sorrowing wife, who was *dévot*e, with the suggestion that the Marquis might succeed in doing what she had long sought to do in vain: "Comtesse, si vous n'y prenez garde, Dangeau vous escamotera ma conversion." Bourdelot, being troubled in his last moments by a priest who used great plainness of speech, implored him to veil his coarse exhortation in Latin. In compliance with this whim, the astonished *cure* proceeded to quote St. Augustine—"Quoi! monsieur," interrupted the penitent, "pouvez vous approuver un pareil langage? Mon oreille est choquée des expressions rudes d'un Afriquain." Vanini, when about to be burnt at Toulouse on the charge of atheism, exclaimed in a clear voice: "Jésus-Christ a, dit-on, craint la mort; et moi, je suis intrépide en ces derniers moments."¹ It

(1) Some examples of callousness on the part of condemned criminals are recorded by Montaigne:—"One that they were leading to the gallows told them they must not carry him through such a street, lest a merchant, that lived there, should arrest him by

must be owned that this not very modest or conciliatory comparison savours somewhat of sensational display. A characteristic form of such love of display has been shown by certain French purists, whose grammatical pedantry haunted them through life, and who split hairs at their dying gasp.* Malherbe—to whose influence over French poetry Boileau has paid a superb compliment—when on his death-bed, rallied his last remains of strength to correct a bystander for an inelegance of diction; being rebuked by his confessor for this levity, he declared that he could not help himself, for he felt bound “*défendre jusqu’à la mort la pureté de la langue Française.*” This may recall the story of the Academician whose life had been occupied with verbal subtleties, and whose dying words were—“*Je vais—ou je m’en vais; car l’Academie n’a pas encore décidé.*” We need hardly observe that this jocularity of moribunds nearly always rings hollow, and that it has little in common with genuine courage like that of the Normans, who (according to Gibbon) sighed in the laziness of peace, and smiled in the agonies of death. Indeed, in the two instances last given, the affectation is as evident, if not quite as offensive, as in the case of those who deliberately act a part in the last scene of their lives, and dress up for dying. Thus, when about to expire, Augustus Cæsar, after sending for a mirror and arranging his hair, asked jestingly whether he was not a good comedian; and, with a like bravado, Buchanan, though strictly forbidden in his fatal illness to drink wine, died nevertheless theatrically holding a glass in his hand and reciting verses of Propertius. Some of these details concerning philosophical death-beds may, we repeat, be doubtful. But, at any rate, there can be no doubt that death was met with ostentatious indifference by that not very philosophical patroness of philosophers, Madame de Pompadour. She put on a silk dress, and painted her face (like Pope’s Narcissa); and, when her confessor was leaving her, she stopped him; “*Attendez un instant, M. le curé; nous nous en irons ensemble.*” Her levity had a fit counterpart in the cynicism of her royal lover, who, on seeing her funeral procession, shed no tear (he had not the *don des larmes*), but merely exclaimed: “*Madame la Marquise aura aujourd’hui un mauvais temps pour son voyage.*”¹ Such cases of apathy, whether on the part of the dying persons themselves or of their friends, may

the way for an old debt. Another said to the hangman, he must not touch his neck for fear of making him laugh outright, he was so ticklish. Another answered his confessor, who promised him that he should that day sup with our Lord, ‘Do you go then,’ said he, ‘in my room, for I, for my part, keep fast to-day.’—Book I. ch. 40.

(1) In a like spirit Butler alludes to the storms which accompanied the death of Cromwell:—

“Toss’d in a furious hurricane
Did Oliver give up his reign.”

Dean Ramsay, in his tales of Scottish humour, relates that a pious Miss Johnstone, without a thought of irreverence, complained of the weather when she was dying:—“Ech, what a night for me to be fleeing through the air!”

be given for what they are worth; but assuredly they ill contrast with the dignified fortitude which was shown by so many of the ancients, and which the ancient poet of annihilation has finely indicated:—

“What horror seest thou in that quiet state,
What bugbear dreams to fright thee after fate?
No ghost, no goblins, that still passage keep;
But all is there serene, in that eternal sleep.”¹

This paean over death has a special interest as exhibiting the pagan tendency even in one who, though in paganism, was not of it—who was what may be termed a pagan infidel. How strangely does his confident and defiant tone differ from the melancholy beauty of the following stanza by another infidel poet—an infidel, however, who was penetrated with modern sentiment, and on whom Christianity had left its mark:—

“This world is the nurse of all we know,
This world is the mother of all we feel,
And the coming of death is a fearful blow
To a brain unencompassed with nerves of steel:
When all that we know, or feel, or see,
Shall pass like an unreal mystery.”

It is true that the same pathetic uneasiness had been shown long before by pagan writers. Adrian, for example, in his celebrated lines, reveals a similar disquietude. But, when he composed those lines, the world had already half gone over from Western strength, one may say, to Eastern tenderness; paganism was being undermined, not indeed by Christianity, but by those more general causes which predisposed men's minds to receive Christianity. Hence in Adrian possibly, as undoubtedly in Marcus Aurelius, the new spiritual forces are apparent which have wrought so powerfully on modern beliefs.

Let us consider those beliefs further. Children, says Mr. Max Müller, help to correct the irregularities of language. They also set in a strong light, and so help to correct, the more flagrant anomalies of belief; and therefore it is interesting to observe the impression which the popular creed produces on their unsophisticated minds. Some time ago, a relative of tender years startled me by the question whether I should dislike going to hell. On my expressing displeasure at so singular an inquiry, the child explained, with equal simplicity and point, that, as most people would go to hell, surely he or I, or one of his parents, or of his brothers and sisters, must be of the number.² As to the condition in which the poor child expected some of his kinsfolk to spend eternity, I may refer to

(1) Lucretius translated by Dryden.

(2) The fear of hell takes various, and sometimes grotesque, forms; as was shown in the story of the dying Scotchman, who asked his minister whether he could save himself from the wrath to come by leaving £10,000 to his kirk. “I canna promise that,” said the shrewd theologian, “but it's worth trying.”

a hymn which used to be sung in a parish church, and which was taught to me in my boyhood. The following verse remains in my memory, after the lapse of twenty years; for it most happily illustrates the orthodox doctrine which, more than any other, took possession of my youthful mind:—

“When I hear the wicked call
On the rocks and hills to fall;
When I see them start and shrink
On the fiery deluge brink;
Then, Lord, shall I fully know,
Not till then, how much I owe.”

This ghastly thanksgiving falls little short of a saying attributed to some noted Evangelical: “Mr. Maurice doesn’t believe in the eternity of punishment, but *we* hope for better things.” Possibly, this last story is apocryphal; but it is certain that a late bishop of the same school discoursed on the supposed difficulty of people being happy in heaven, while knowing that their deceased kinsfolk were elsewhere. In heaven, he explained, sympathy with the will of God will be indefinitely strengthened; at the same time, ties of family will be weakened: so that, instead of pitying our doomed relatives, we shall actually take part with the divine justice which dooms them. Alas! how often one has thought that, on the first day of creation, if benevolence had really been armed with omnipotence, the *fiat* would have been, not “Let there be light,” but “Let an infinite number of sentient beings be perfectly happy for ever.”

Of course it is not meant that these dismal doctrines have ever been fully realised by a large number of persons; otherwise the case put by Bishop Butler might occur, and whole districts might go mad. Yet, in all probability, the “darkness visible” has really been more visible than we are apt to think; and especially it has been seen by the thoughtful and inquiring. The Puritans, with their glimmering light, were more disturbed by it than the Catholics were; and, if orthodoxy stands still, while investigation goes forward, the evil is likely to be an increasing one. The bracing intellectual air that we now breathe will bring the latent diseases of our religion out. It will become more and more difficult for reflecting persons to hold the popular creed without partly realising it, and without the realisation making them miserable.¹

(1) This opinion, as well as some others that I have expressed, is confirmed by Mr. Mill, at the end of the essay on the *Utility of Religion* (pp. 115-122), which I did not see till the text of my article was finished. I venture to think that, in other parts of that essay, he makes too little of the distress arising from the popular belief. It is true that pious relatives, whose son or brother has died either in immorality or in unbelief, seldom think it *probable* that he will be damned. But I am certain that they often find it hard to drive away the thought that the unpleasant contingency is *possible*. Indeed, unless their nerves are in a much better condition than their heads, or else than their hearts, this could scarcely be otherwise.

Indeed, it is no mere supposition, but an historical fact, that the "glad tidings" of orthodoxy are tidings the most appalling that ever exercised a great influence; under no other system has there been so intense and widespread a belief in future torments, themselves so intense, general, and prolonged. But on this historical fact some of the early Utilitarians, including more than one eminent historian, founded the supposition that the success of Christianity was one of the saddest events in history; their opinion being, as one of their number told me, that the belief in hell, by embittering the fear of death, has "cast a gloom over modern life." It may serve to set forth our own view of the limits and results of the fear of death, if we offer in conclusion two remarks on this more extreme view, and on the antichristian iconoclasm which some followers of the great Bentham founded upon it. In the first place, one may regard the belief in hell as having embittered the fear of death,—and yet be, in no sense, an iconoclast. For, through long usage, the moral conduct of most men is at present so dependent on theological dogmas, that those dogmas may be likened to the supports of a lame man, and should only be withdrawn by slow degrees, here a little and there a little; otherwise, the national morality, stripped too suddenly of its religious bandages, might realise Mr. Greg's forebodings and fall; and great would be the fall of it. It would, indeed, be an odd application of my remarks on moral courage, if I concluded with a panegyric on our British cowardice in expressing, nay in holding, unpopular opinions. Assuredly, we should be better off in many ways if we could put a speedy end to our intellectual anarchy and illogical compromises. Yet a comparison of the present state of the different European countries may reconcile us to the thought that our divines play the part of a spiritual House of Lords, and ratify, however slowly and ungraciously, the changes which "the common sense of most" forces upon them. That they will act thus in regard to the belief in hell, we may infer from their concessions in other directions. In divers departments of knowledge, a reformer, by this time, knows what to expect. The first generation of theologians will execrate him; a later generation will try to ignore him; while a third will stand aghast at the judicial blindness which so long overlooked the scriptural foreshadowings of the new discovery.¹

(1) To give an instance: I have heard a highly instructed clergyman argue from the Bible in favour of the antiquity of man, and of the original plurality of human races. For with whose aid, and for whom, did Cain build a city? Also, whom did he marry, being an outcast before the birth of his sisters? My friend omitted to state whether it was by means of swimming that the non-Adamites survived the Deluge; which of us, not being sprung from Adam, are free from original sin; and how little pain women, that are not daughters of Eve, have in childbirth. In like manner, the Pauline epistles contain, at least, two Universalist texts, which, however much opposed to other texts, are quite enough for liberal theologians. I may add that there is a text sanctioning the principle of euthanasia (at least for persons of good family): 2 Macca-

This is not very pleasant for the reformer; and, if he does not say in his haste that all clergymen are untruthful, he will at least be tempted to rail at their vicarious penitence in "building the sepulchres" of the philosophers, whom their fathers persecuted. Yet, when his railing fit is over, he will probably think that we should congratulate ourselves on the elasticity of modern dogmas, and especially on what I lately heard a Catholic priest denounce as *la souplesse de Protestantisme*. Many evils, such as the theological disunion of the sexes, are mitigated by the fact that divines follow lay inquirers, though at a respectful distance, and that science, as it were, takes religion in tow. Therefore, the wiser among us are seeking to drop hell out of the Bible as quietly, and about as logically, as we already contrive to disregard the plain texts forbidding Christians to go to law, and Christian women to plait their hair. And thus we may hope that, without any cataclysm in the theological strata, but by a gradual process of subsidence and upheaval, a change will come over those too consistent Puritans, who, through fear of death, are all their life subject to bondage.

Our other comment on the Benthamite position is of a wholly different kind. It is by no means clear that the modern *streptitus Acherontis arari*, however silly and distracting, has on the whole been injurious. The teaching of the clergy, though in itself not good, may yet, as the clergy would express it, have been overruled for good. It would, no doubt, be far better that the path of life should be a mere *cul de sac*, than that it should lie on the brink of an unseen precipice. But it is not, on that account, an evil that man should at one time have believed in this precipice. The error may have been the only means of inducing him to set the example of treading warily, and to smooth the path for his successors by taking stumbling-blocks out of their way. In other words, Christianity has made the human race less imperfect through suffering. If men at first became sadder, they became also wiser; and they showed their wisdom in trying to lessen sadness. They that are whole, says the Scripture, have no need of a physician; and, without an exaggerated view of human depravity and misery, our forefathers might have lacked the stimulus for repentance and reformation. At any rate, having the stimulus, they repented and reformed in a way in which the pagans, not having the stimulus, did not repent and reform. Hence, looking to the past, we may rejoice that, not *L'Allegro*, but *Il Penseroso* is the man whom Christianity delighteth to honour; and that, instead of the pagan *Carpe diem*, her watch-word is *Memento mori*.

LIONEL A. TOLLEMACHE.

bees xiv. 42, *et seq.* Not only "doth the Church read" this book "for example of life and instruction of manners," but (as Alford admits) it is recognised as an authority in the Epistle to the Hebrews. How long will euthanasia be thought unchristian?

THE COPYRIGHT QUESTION.

COPYRIGHT, like currency, is a question which affords an infinite field for discussion. To provide a model subject for perpetual controversy, certain conditions are requisite. The subject in question should involve abstract principles which are incapable of practical application, conflicting interests which cannot all be satisfied in accordance with logical equity, and accepted axioms which cannot be adapted to the circumstances of the case. All these conditions are fulfilled in the copyright controversy. As long, therefore, as some men continue to write books, and others are found to read them, the question of the respective rights of the purveyors and purchasers of literature will continue to be argued, without any positive agreement being arrived at, as to the exact standard by which these rights should be estimated. The appointment of a Royal Commission to examine the whole question of copyright, is certain to give a renewed impetus to this never-ending controversy. On the eve, therefore, of the opening of the discussion, it may not be useless to submit certain general considerations with respect to this moot issue. Next to offering a solution of a problem, the best service you can render to those engaged in solving the question is to show that no absolutely satisfactory solution is possible. The fundamental error into which most of the disputants concerning copyright seem to me to have fallen, is that they attempt to base on first principles, rights which, whether equitable or otherwise, exist solely by virtue of convention.

Within the last few weeks, the advocates of what I may call the divine right of authorship have found a vigorous champion in the person of Mr. Charles Reade. In a series of able letters contributed to the *Pall Mall Gazette*, the author of "Never too Late to Mend" has endeavoured to establish the thesis, that by equity, if not by law, an author is entitled to the absolute unconditional possession of the creations of his brain, both for himself and for his heirs for ever. Mr. Reade is eminently entitled to plead the cause of the author. He was the first English man of letters of any note, who protested against the wrongs to which foreign dramatists were exposed at the hands of English adapters, and in a now little known book entitled, characteristically, the "Eighth Commandment," he fell foul of a system which was far more prevalent twenty years ago, than it is at present. Yet, though I am anxious to do full justice to Mr. Reade's singleness of purpose, I cannot accept his conclusions. Put succinctly, the argument of the letters to which I refer may I think be

stated as follows. A book is the product of mental labour; mental labour is entitled to the same protection as manual labour; the property acquired by the toil of the hands belongs to the producer, as a *κτημα ἐς αἰ*, a perpetual possession; therefore, the property acquired by the work of the brain should in like fashion belong for ever to the artificer. Q.E.D. Now to this syllogism, once admitted the premises, it is hard to take exception. My objection is that I dispute the premises. In the first place all property, as it seems to me, is the creation of law. So long as men hold their possessions by the sole force of the strong arm, law does not and cannot exist. But as soon as society reaches a stage of development in which the many become more powerful than the individual, the strong arm becomes incompetent to protect its own possessions, and their tenure has to be secured by certain agreements, understandings, conventions, which, for the want of any more definite phrase, may be described by the name of law. If, therefore, property exists in virtue of common consent, or in other words of law, it follows that it can be modified by common consent, that is by the power to which it owes its existence. The statement as thus made is almost a truism, yet in discussions of the kind with which I am now concerned, it seems to be constantly assumed that property has some inherent indefeasible title of existence derived from some higher than human authority. No doubt thinkers of Mr. Reade's power of mind would dismiss any fallacy of this kind. What they would urge is that in every well-organized society the end and object of all law is to secure to the individual the right of enjoying his own property in peace and security, and that, therefore, property has an inalienable right to protection. As a general proposition, I should not dispute this, but I fail to see how the proposition can be practically applied.

Probably there is no country in the world in which respect for the rights of property is carried so far as it is with us. That a man has a right to do what he likes with his own, to waste or injure it if he pleases, and to leave it after death to whom he thinks fit, is regarded by us as the basis of our social system. Yet we admit by our acts, if not by our theories, that it is not only the privilege but the duty of the law, to interfere with the power of the individual to deal as he likes with his own property, whenever we think, rightly or wrongly, that his mode of so dealing is injurious to the community. We forbid entails beyond certain limits, we prevent the accumulation of property after death, we take away a man's land whether he wishes to sell it or not, if the land is required for public purposes. Nor can there be any doubt, that if occasion should arise, we should go much farther in the way of interference. If there is one form of property, the ownership of which our law surrounds with exceptional privileges, it is that of

landed estate. By the law, a landowner may let his land to whom, on what terms, and in whatever form he thinks fit. But if our landlords were to refuse either to let their land, or to cultivate it themselves, the law would assuredly curtail their freedom of possession. As a matter of fact, self-interest causes land in the long run to be bought and sold like other articles of commerce. But if this were not the case, no theory of the abstract right of a man to his own land would long be allowed to stand in the way of the welfare of the community. Any number of instances might be added. But I think enough has been said to prove my point, that property is only held by favour of an indefinite convention, called by the name of law, the unexpressed understanding being that the property thus held should not be employed in a way detrimental to the interests of society.

I have perhaps dwelt upon this point at unnecessary length, but it is necessary to clear the ground, and no understanding can possibly be arrived at as to the question of copyright until you dismiss the fallacy that the owner of literary property, or, for that matter, of any form of property, has any inherent right to insist upon the law securing to him the absolute usufruct of his possessions, whether those possessions have been obtained by his own labour, by purchase, or by inheritance. Society has not only full power, but full right, to determine what classes of property it shall protect, and upon what terms. No doubt it is easily conceivable that society might deal out a different measure to different classes of property. Indeed this is the very complaint that is made by those who wish books to be made the absolute property of their owners to the same extent as land or funds; and if this difference of measure is based on arbitrary or inequitable considerations, the owners of literary wares have a ground of complaint; but their real complaint, even on this hypothesis, is that undue partiality has been shown to others, not that they themselves have been defrauded of any inherent and inalienable right.

Thus my first proposition is that there is no abstract reason why copyright should exist at all. It is most desirable, as a matter of expediency, that protection should be given to literary as to other property; but the period for which, and the terms upon which, it should be accorded is a matter entirely within the competence of the law to determine. If we argue upon the ground of expediency, dismissing that of abstract right, there is little difficulty in defining the general principles which should underlie all legislation with respect to property. The object should be to give such protection as shall encourage individuals to give the toil and outlay requisite to the production of property, and at the same time to limit such protection sufficiently to secure this property, whatever its quality may be, being easily accessible to the general public. To take a very simple instance: it is a matter of vital importance to the com-

munity that bakers should have sufficient certainty that the loaves they knead will be their own property, to induce them to carry on the trade of bread-making; on the other hand it is of equal importance to the community that bakers should not have such exclusive property in the bread they bake as to enable them to command a prohibitive price. In the case of the makers of bread, as of all elementary articles, the latter risk is hindered by the free action of competition. Nobody makes loaves for any other object than to sell them; and if one baker refused to sell, except at a prohibitive price, a dozen others would at once bid for his custom by underselling him. But if we could conceive the possibility of one baker getting into his hands all the flour available for bread-making, and then refusing to sell his loaves except for gold, the State would most assuredly step in and modify by law the proprietary rights of the baker. Whether this would be just in the abstract it is beyond my purpose to consider. All I assert is that such would be the policy adopted by any community, no matter what theories it might hold as to the sanctity of property. Fortunately no such contingency is likely to arise with respect to all the various descriptions of property which are the product of manual labour; but when we come to property which is the product of mental as well as manual labour, the case becomes infinitely more complicated. In fact, though the word property is applied alike to creations of the brain and hands, yet the two properties thus designated are fundamentally different.

It would take far more room than I can spare to point out all these differences. One illustration will, I think, suffice to show the practical difference with which I am mainly concerned. If there is one sort of mental property—the ownership of which would seem, by abstract equity, to belong most distinctly to the creator—it is a discovery which marks an æra in the history of science and civilisation. According to the divine right of property theory, the steam engine ought to have been the perpetual possession of Watt and his heirs. Upon this supposition, the right of supplying the United Kingdom with steam engines would be vested in some firm or individual, who, either by descent or purchase, chanced to be the representatives of Watt. It may be said that even in this case the public would not suffer, as it would be the interest of the firm to supply as many engines as could be sold. Little reflection is needed to show that this is a fallacy. If it were not for the risk of competition, it would clearly be more for the personal advantage of the manufacturers to sell ten engines at a profit of £1,000 a piece than a hundred engines at a profit of £100 a piece. Indeed it is obvious that any prolonged restriction in the right of manufacturing engines, in favour of Watt and his heirs, would have been fatal to the development of our national industry. In the same way it will be found on investiga-

tion that the protection accorded to all kinds of property, in whose production mental labour is a material factor, is always more or less restricted in the interest of the public at large. I think, too, it will also be found that the more largely mental effort enters into the production, the more closely the protection afforded to the producer is curtailed; and this is not due to any contempt of intellectual as compared with manual products, but to a conviction that the same absolute ownership in respect of the former is attended with detriment to the public interest, which does not arise from complete protection being accorded to the producer of the latter.

Thus, if my view is correct, there is no abstract principle or standard by which you can determine what degree of protection should be granted to property in general, and notably to that peculiar class of property to which copyright belongs. Just as in the Constitution of the United States it is declared that all rights not specifically assigned to the Federal Union belong to the States, so it may be said that, as a rule, all property to which the community does not claim a right should belong to the individual owner. But beyond this it is impossible to lay down any definite rule. The question is one of degree, not of principle. It is obviously for the interest of the community to encourage the production of works of literature. If it could be shown that authors would not devote themselves to writing books unless they had the same absolute ownership guaranteed to them as a shoemaker has in respect of the boots he manufactures, then it would be necessary to give authors a freehold instead of a leasehold. But such a contention cannot seriously be sustained. Practically exactly the same number of boots, loaves, or coats would be produced if the cobbler, baker, and tailor knew that their ownership in their manufactures would terminate at the expiration of a long period of years. Nor is there, in so far as I can see, any reason to think that either the quantity or the quality of books produced would vary, whether the period assigned for their enjoyment of copyright was forty, sixty, or a hundred years. On the other hand, there are manifest reasons why it is undesirable, in the interest of the public, that books should remain a permanent monopoly in the hands of individuals. The few works *rari nantes in gurgite vasto* which survive the first years of their publication, and take their place in the literature of their country, become in an especial sense the property of succeeding generations. It would be a public calamity if the works of our classics were not accessible at prices which come within everybody's reach. It should be counted to the credit of mankind that few books, if any, survive their authors which it is not for the advantage of the world to have read. The cheaper therefore standard works can be sold the better for the public; and no process can be devised by which books are so certain

to be sold cheap as by the open competition of trade. If the right of publishing the works of Shakespeare and Milton belonged to some inheritor by descent or purchase, it is not only possible but probable that they would only be brought out at prices too high for the mass of purchasers. Moreover, the very issue of our standard works would, on this hypothesis, depend on the interests, inclination, or caprice of an individual, who might easily be indifferent to pecuniary considerations. Suppose a by no means impossible supposition, that Lady Byron had possessed the absolute ownership of her husband's works. It is as certain as anything well can be that she would have refused to issue fresh editions of his poems after his death, and that thus for a generation or more "Childe Harold" and "Don Juan" would have been removed from general perusal. This is perhaps an extreme case. But it is obvious that in numerous instances the descendants of a great author, if they retained absolute control over the republication of his works, would be led either by conviction or prejudice to alter, curtail, or even suppress in part, the master-works of his genius. Fancy what would be the fate of Gibbon, if the "Decline and Fall" was the property of Archbishop Manning, or of Lingard's History of England if it passed into the hands of Mr. Newdegate! In fact, writers who have written works destined to live after them, possess only one safeguard in virtue of which they can rely on the memorials of their genius being kept fresh and intact in the minds of posterity, and that safeguard is found in the simple fact that, after a certain brief interval, the perpetual publication of their writings is provided for by the ordinary laws of supply and demand.

It would not, therefore, be for the interest of the public or of literature that authors should have the same unlimited ownership of their books as shoemakers have of their shoes, and it cannot, as I hold, be shown that a limited ownership curtails or impedes the publication of books. Granted these propositions, it follows that society does wisely in only according a terminable protection to the products of mental labour. How long the protective period should be is an open question. There is no obvious appropriateness in a period of forty-two years; and any evidence adduced before the Commission to show that this period is unduly brief ought to receive the most careful consideration. If there is any craft which the community should put on the footing of the most favoured trade, it is that of letters. All I contend for is that in the end the interests of literature, like those of any other trade, are and must be subordinate to those of the community. At the same time, it is worth bearing in mind that the question is one which, after all, affects a very small section of the literary brotherhood. Nobody who has not studied the subject can form any

opinion of how short the average life of books is in the vast majority of instances. I am not speaking of novels or of light literature, but of what are called the higher branches of letters. Historical and scientific books necessarily fall out of date with the progress of knowledge; while as for works of fiction and poetry, even of sterling merit, the taste of one generation differs from another. The fashion of to-day is obsolete to-morrow. It is utterly impossible to lay down any general definition of works of note. Perhaps the fairest, though at best a rough definition, would be to say that a work of note is one the fame of having written which attaches to its author for life. Yet even of the works which come up to this standard, it is but a very scanty percentage which survive for a dozen years. I do not mean to say that it would be impossible to find copies of all the books which appeared a score of years ago, and were justly regarded at the time of their publication as valuable contributions to literature; though the difficulty is far greater than one would suppose at first sight. What I do mean is, that of those books not one in twenty—I should doubt if one in fifty—is in active circulation at present. Copies are to be found in libraries, but they are not for sale unless they are specially demanded. Their reputation may survive; but for business purposes, as articles of literary barter, they have ceased to possess any negotiable value. Nor is the case very different even with the books which by some process corresponding to the survival of the fittest attain a more lasting existence. No doubt the copyright of Milton and Shakespeare, and a score of other English classics, would be a valuable negotiable commodity at the present day, and in all likelihood for many a long year to come. But the chance of any living author—however great his existing reputation may be—attaining to this Walhalla of letters, is so remote and so uncertain that it can hardly enter into the estimate of a purchaser. Supposing the copyrights of Mr. Tennyson's, Mr. Froude's and George Eliot's works were put up for sale; I believe the price given by the trade would be almost exactly the same whether the copyright was for half a century, or for a century, or for perpetuity. I have merely singled out these names, not from any opinion of my own as to the estimate posterity will place upon them, but simply because they belong to the class of writers of our day who, whether with or without reason, are popularly regarded as likely to be read by future generations, and who in consequence can offer to purchasers of their copyrights the chance of buying a property which may be of pecuniary value a century or more hence as well as at the present day. Yet if, as I hold, this prospect, even in the most favourable instances, produces no appreciable increase in saleable value, it is difficult to argue that authors suffer much pecuniary loss by the limitation of their rights of ownership in the creation of their brains.

Indeed, if the question of home copyright was alone concerned, I do not think we should hear much active complaint about the action of the existing law. To the great majority of men, and especially of Englishmen, an abstract grievance which does not touch their interests or their comfort, is a very bearable misfortune. No doubt those who hold the doctrine of the divine right of an author to the absolute ownership of his literary creations, would still contend that to limit in any way the duration of copyright was an outrage upon equity. But, as long as the period of protection was sufficiently long to render the saleable value of a book practically equivalent to what it would be, if the protection was perpetual, the system of limited copyright would meet with little opposition. The real question which interests the literary craft is that of international copyright; and the reason why so much outcry is raised against the injustice of limiting the rights of an author in the proprietorship of his own productions, is that this assumption is essential to establish the thesis, that the author has an inherent and distinct right to demand protection for his works from foreign States as well as from his own country. If an author has an indelible, indefeasible right to the absolute ownership of his writings; if, in fact, to repeat a phrase I have often used already, there exists a divine right of copyright, there is, to say the least, a strong presumption that the wilful appropriation of this property by foreign States without the consent of the owner is an international offence. If, on the other hand, as I have endeavoured to show, the State has not only the power but the right to determine upon what conditions and for what period a subject who happens to be the owner of literary property shall be protected in the possession of his products, it follows *a fortiori*, that foreign States have no obligation to grant copyright to alien authors except in so far as they may deem it for their own advantage to do so.

Thus, if my argument is admitted, all the epithets of piracy, and so forth, which are applied by writers of Mr. Reade's school to the action of States which refuse to recognise the claim of a foreign author to copyright within their dominions, are singularly inappropriate. Let me illustrate my meaning by a familiar incident. If you breed and rear pheasants at great cost and trouble, the law protects your winged property, so long as the birds remain on your land; but declines to do so as soon as the birds fly into your neighbour's lands. Now, if your neighbour chooses to shoot your pheasants, whenever they pass over his fields, or even lays down bait to induce them to stray across the boundary, you may call his conduct indiscreet, unneighbourly, and ill-bred. But to call him a law-breaker and a robber would put you entirely in the wrong. A State is under no legal obligation whatever to a foreign author; and to call any individual in the State a pirate and a swindler,

because he chooses to reprint the author's books, is a mere abuse of language. Moreover, as coercion is out of the question, and as the only practical chance of obtaining copyright abroad for our own authors is to convince foreign nations that it is for their own profit to grant the demand, the less bandying of abuse and reproaches we have, the better for the end which we have in view. If we are to arrive at any satisfactory result, we must deal with facts, not with theories, with appeals to interest, not to sentiment. To speak the plain truth, we wish foreign nations to conclude a commercial treaty with us in respect of literary wares, and if we hope to succeed, we must look at the terms of the bargain we propose, calmly and dispassionately.

Now, in the first place, it is worth bearing in mind, that this so called international question of copyright is in its practical bearing almost confined to the Anglo-Saxon communities. The question of translations and adaptations stands upon a different footing from that of reproductions; and reproductions only take place, as a rule, in countries speaking the same language as that in which the original work reproduced is composed. In as far as my observation extends, French works are not republished in Italy, nor are German books republished in France, except in the form of translations. How far this is due to internal laws, to the extent to which foreign languages are familiar on the Continent to the classes who are likely to read works written in another tongue from their own, or to the cheap rates at which books are published in continental countries, it is beyond my present purpose to inquire. All I wish to note is the fact, that as a rule, foreign authors have no market for their books in their original form out of their own country, and have therefore no strong personal motive for interesting themselves in the subject of an international copyright. French authors would unquestionably gain if there was a more rigid international copyright between France and Belgium. But though the principle involved is the same, yet the value to French authors of obtaining possession of the Belgian market is utterly insignificant compared with the importance to English authors of securing the markets belonging to countries in which English is the dominant language. Practically for the time being the copyright question is almost exclusively an Anglo-Saxon one.

To take a rough estimate, you may say that, including the United States, Canada, Australia, and the various British Colonies, there are at the least eighty millions of persons on the face of the globe to which English is the language of daily life, and who, in as far as they read at all, know no other literature than that written in the English tongue. Now, an English author who writes a book in England, has his right of sale guaranteed only within the United Kingdom. (I am dealing now with the general issue, and have no need to hamper

my argument with qualifications as to certain partial privileges secured by conventions.) The British author has a monopoly guaranteed him in a population of some thirty millions. If the monopoly could be extended to the United States and the Colonies, he would nearly treble the number of readers, who if they bought his book at all, must buy it on his own terms and for his profit. A mere counting of heads only shows inadequately the extra profit our author would obtain by the extension of his monopoly. From a variety of causes, the percentage of book readers, and still more of book buyers, in any given number of American or British colonies, is far larger than in the same number of Englishmen living within the Four Seas. Thus I think it is no exaggeration to say that if an international copyright could be established between all the various communities composing Sir Charles Dilke's "Greater Britain," the English author would acquire fresh markets for his wares at least twice as large and as valuable as those which he now commands. In other words, the saleable value of his wares would be trebled; and for every pound he receives now he ought to get three. No doubt, according to the system of publishing which prevails in England, the publisher, not the author, would get the lion's share of the increased profit in the first instance; but in the course of a short time the fact that a book was worth more would make the price paid for it to the author larger. My meaning can be shown by reference to this very article I am now writing. There are in the United States certain periodicals which republish all magazine articles in our English reviews, which, either from their subject or their authorship, are likely to interest the American public. As the honour is one I share with many scores of brother essayists, I may mention without any special vanity that my name is included among the list of English writers whose magazine articles the periodicals in question engage to supply to their Transatlantic subscribers. In any case this article will be republished in America within a few days after its appearance in the Fortnightly Review. Neither I nor the proprietors of this Review shall receive one sixpence for the re-issue. If a copyright law, however, existed between England and the United States this article could not be republished without consent. This consent would have to be paid for, and the saleable value of the article would be thereby augmented. To authors of high eminence or popularity the gain would be enormous. Mr. Tennyson and George Eliot, and still more Miss Braddon, must lose thousands yearly by the absence of any copyright with America alone. The loss, as I have shown, extends down to the writers of ephemeral articles; and it is not too much to say, that the whole literary craft in England would experience a sensible rise in the remunerativeness of their profession if they could have the same copyright privileges guaranteed

them across the Atlantic as they now possess within the Four Seas. In asking, therefore, for an international copyright, English men of letters are virtually asking for a large bonus for themselves. That this is so, is no argument against the equity of their demand. But that this is so, is plain truth and a fact which should not be lost sight of in the controversy.

The originators of the demand would probably urge, with perfect good faith, that they were only asking for themselves the advantages they were willing and anxious to accord to others. But this argument, however plausible, will not bear the test of examination. The reciprocity, as the Irishman said, is all on one side. No doubt it would be an immense advantage to Australian and Canadian authors to have the absolute command of the English market for the sale of their books, if there were any such authors to profit by the boon. But the Colonies are not—and for many years to come are not likely to be—the birthplaces of indigenal literature. The conditions of colonial life are not favourable to the production of literary talent; and such talent as arises there gravitates of necessity towards the mother country. For many a long year, England must be the main factory of literature for Anglo-Saxondom. This assertion would probably be disputed by our American kinsmen; and, whatever estimate may be taken of the individual merits of Transatlantic authors, there can be no question that the United States has already produced a literature of its own. Washington Irving, Longfellow, Motley, Hawthorne, and many other American writers, have as large a public on this side the Atlantic as they have in their own country; and American men of letters have a similar interest to their English fellow craftsmen in the establishment of an Anglo-American copyright. Yet, as a matter of fact, any traveller who has visited the United States must be aware that their supply of literature is, in the main, derived from England. Of the books to be found in libraries and shops, and displayed on bookstalls, nine out of ten are of English parentage. Thus, thanks to the absence of any law of international copyright, the American public is provided with an admirable cheap popular literature; and as the Americans are emphatically a reading people, this advantage is very widely appreciated. The book-producing interest, as compared with the book-consuming interest, is relatively far weaker in America than it is with us; while American publishers, as distinguished from authors, have the strongest motive for desiring the maintenance of a state of things under which they pay nothing for the great bulk of the books they publish. Thus, if we propose to the United States to give books written in England equal rights with books written in America, and *vice versa*, we are asking them, from a pecuniary point of view, to give us much more than they can hope to receive. As

a mere money transaction, the bargain would be an unprofitable one for America, much as a convention to the effect that a sovereign and a dollar should be held to be both of equal value in all Anglo-American payments, would be to England. Of course, if copyright can be claimed as a matter of abstract right, the question whether acquiescence in the demand is profitable or unprofitable is, or ought to be, foreign to the issue. But if I am correct in my view, that all copyright depends upon considerations of general expediency, not of individual right, the commercial aspect to which I have referred is of very signal importance. It is to the enlightened interest of the American public, not to their sense of duty, that we have to appeal.

Now to my mind there is one argument, and one argument only, on which we can rely with much chance of success, in any appeal to America to establish an international copyright with England. That argument is, the injury inflicted upon the development of American literature by the absence of any such copyright. Under any system, however disadvantageous, books will be written. Happily for the world, the desire of making money is not the sole, or even the principal inducement which causes men to devote themselves to the pursuit of letters. But still, if a country is ever to possess a national literature, the trade of letters must be made a paying one. At present, native American literature struggles in vain against a crushing competition. Even if all other conditions were equal, a writer living in an old, highly organized society, like our own, would have a start over an author of equal ability whose lot fell in a new and half-settled community. But, as things are, the American author is undersold and underbid in his own market. Americans in Europe are so fond of boasting of their own literary celebrities, that persons unacquainted with the States can hardly realise how poorly literature is remunerated in the great Republic. Socially, the position of an American author of note is an exceptionally brilliant one; financially, it is almost as exceptionally poor. This statement applies even to the celebrities of Transatlantic literature. Longfellow, Motley, Hawthorne, always got far lower prices from publishers in their own country, than they would otherwise have done, from the simple fact that these publishers could, and did, publish editions of Tennyson, Froude, and Dickens, without having to pay a cent to their authors. If this is the case with known and popular authors, whose writings command a large sale, it is still more the case with young and unknown aspirants to literary fame. If an American poet, essayist, or novelist requests a publisher in his own country to bring out his writings, the almost invariable answer is, "Why should I incur certain cost and trouble, and probable loss, in order to publish your book, while I can bring out a similar work by a well-known English writer, with the certainty of incurring neither cost nor trouble, and

the further certainty, that if both books are an equal success, the profit on the unpaid English book will be far larger than on the paid American book?" The reply is unanswerable; and the result is, that in America authorship is not sufficiently well paid to compete with other pursuits. The more thoughtful portion of the American public are alive to this fact; and, as the possession of a national literature is an object to which great importance is popularly attached in the United States, a movement in favour of an international copyright, in order to protect the interests of the native author, would have some chance of success.

On the other hand, the Transatlantic public are not prepared to forego the supply of cheap literature they now enjoy by the reproduction of English books. All, therefore, we can reasonably hope at present is a compromise, by which English authors may be secured by law a certain bonus or royalty on all American reproductions of their books. If this opinion is correct, it follows that, as a matter of sale or barter, our colonies are less likely even than the United States to listen favourably to any proposition for extending to their territories the full powers of copyright enjoyed by British authors within the Four Seas. Australia, Canada, and the Cape have absolutely no literature or literary class of their own. There are, indeed, Canadians like Mr. Justice Haliburton, and there may be Australians whose names I cannot recall, who have written books familiar to British readers. But these authors have published their books in England, under the protection of our copyright laws. I am not aware, however, of a single instance in which a book written and published in one of our Colonies has been reproduced in England, with the view of obtaining an independent sale in the home market. Of course an appeal may be made to the colonists, on the ground of their common allegiance and their common interest in the literary fame of England, which would hardly be applicable to our American kinsmen; but these appeals are not likely to outweigh the conviction of the colonial mind, that it is a gain to have their market supplied with home literature at colonial prices. Both from the Colonies, therefore, and from the United States, we have no chance at present, as I am advised, of obtaining complete, or anything like complete, reciprocity in respect of copyright. Unless, however, we are resolved to prefer no bread to half a loaf, we may obtain a compromise.

Last year the Canadian Government proposed an arrangement by which English authors should have a certain percentage guaranteed them on all copies of their works republished in the Dominion. Roughly speaking, the Canadian publisher was to retain the power he exercises at present of reproducing any book published in England at his own price, and without the consent of the author. But, on the other hand, the author was to have a claim, enforceable by the laws

of the Dominion, to a royalty of ten per cent. on every copy thus published. How far the arrangement in question would work satisfactorily, whether its terms are sufficiently remunerative to the author, and to what extent it is consistent with the legal status of the Dominion in respect of the mother country, are points on which I need not enter. I only allude to it as showing the general character of any arrangement such as, to my mind, can be proposed with any possibility of acceptance. We have got to face the fact that, whether justly or unjustly, neither the Americans nor the colonists will abandon their liberty of republication. This being so, any system of international or intercolonial copyright must be based on the understanding that the British author has no power of deciding whether, and on what terms, his books shall be republished out of England. It may be said such an understanding would be gravely unjust. My answer is, that, whether unjust or not, it would be less unjust than no understanding at all. Suppose a man had built a road at his own cost and labour, and run a line of coaches on it for his own profit, and on his own terms. Let us suppose, further, that a number of rival carriers asserted that his rates were too high for their customers, and insisted on running cheap lines of their own on his road; and suppose, finally, that the original builder of the road discovered that, whether from considerations of public policy, or from want of jurisdiction, the law was unable or unwilling to give him a monopoly of running coaches over his own road. Under this supposition, a wise man would, I venture to think, make the best arrangement he could with his competitors; and if, in consideration of his having made the road, they offered to pay him a toll on every vehicle which used the thoroughfare, he would do well not to reject the proposal, even though he held the use of the road without his consent to be an abuse of his rights, and an infringement of abstract justice. Now, the position of the English author goes on all-fours with that of my hypothetical road constructor.

The difficulty of forming any satisfactory compromise between the interests of the English author, and those of readers not subject to the jurisdiction of our Copyright Law, is immensely increased by the peculiar conditions of our publishing trade. If books were published in England on the same scale of prices as in America and the Colonies, or for that matter, in any other country, there would be comparatively little inducement to publish pirated editions of English books abroad. Indeed, it is doubtful if the superior cheapness of production in England would not outweigh the cost of transport, and enable English publishers to undersell their Transatlantic competitors. But in England alone, of all book-reading countries, books are published to be hired, not bought. The very same book if brought out at one and the same time in New York and London, would be sold in the

former place for a dollar, in the latter for a pound, and this difference of price applies to works into which the question of the author's remuneration does not enter. The reason of the difference is that the American publisher bids for the custom of the public, the English publisher for that of the circulating libraries. Given the same number of readers of a book on both sides the Atlantic, it will, I believe, be found that ninety out of a hundred in America have bought the book, while in England the same proportion would have borrowed it. People know their own business best, and our publishers probably find their advantage in selling a hundred copies of a book at a profit of a pound a piece to a circulating library, rather than in selling a thousand copies to the general public at a profit of two shillings. Like any other traders, they are the only judges on what system they shall buy or sell. But so long as it is the custom of our bookselling trade to publish books at prices beyond the reach of the general public, we are placed at a disadvantage in any attempt to secure copyright for English works abroad.

I have left myself, I find, but little space to say anything as to the cognate subjects of translations and adaptations. As to translations, there is no difficulty whatever in identifying their parentage, and any arrangement by which an author could be secured some description of ownership in foreign editions of his works, might easily be extended to translations. But with regard to adaptations, it seems to me impossible to lay down any definite rule as to what is, and what is not permissible. The adaptation of a play, or the dramatization of a novel, may vary from the gravest plagiarism to the most innocent reproduction of incidents and ideas which are the common property of authorship. I do not say that something might not be done with advantage to protect dramatists and novelists from the wholesale appropriation of their labours by adapters. But it will, I think, be matter for regret, if the comparatively simple issue of literary copyright is mixed up with the infinitely more complicated question of the limits within which adaptation is legal or illegal.

If my readers have followed my argument, they will, I think, agree with me in the following conclusions: first, that the principle on which our existing law of limited copyright is based is not intrinsically unjust; secondly, that all demands for its modification must rest not on contentions of abstract right, but of public convenience; and, thirdly, that in respect of international copyright, authors must look for a royalty, not for an absolute title of ownership. These conclusions may seem of a somewhat negative character; but the more they are kept in view the better chance, I hold, there will be of the copyright controversy resulting in practical gain to the interests of literature.

EDWARD DICEY.

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

It is still eastern affairs that absorb the attention of Europe. Beyond them nothing passes of really serious moment. In Spain Carlism defends its last positions with a furious intrepidity, while at Madrid rival intrigues are spun and unspun without ceasing round the still tottering throne of the youthful king. In Germany two laws of considerable importance have come under discussion in the Reichsrath; a tax-law, designed to repair the deficit of the imperial budget, and a revision of the penal code, aiming at repressing abuses of freedom of the press, and at reaching certain offences committed by public functionaries. By way of augmenting the revenue of the Empire, it is proposed to put a tax on various articles of consumption, notably on beer, and this makes the bill extremely unpopular. The Chancellor, coming from Varzin for the purpose, made a speech which abounded both in ideas and in racy humour. Prince Bismarck was evidently in excellent spirits, either because his health was stronger, or because the aspect of European affairs pleased him better than it did in the summer. To show that nothing would induce him to quarrel with the majority, he announced that the cabinet question should not be pressed forward. He seems to lean more than he used to do upon public opinion; he needs all its support in his contest with ultramontaniam. He passed a pompous eulogy on indirect taxation. This system is naturally convenient to statesmen with vast designs to carry out; for, as the nation pays indirect taxes almost without knowing it, they can make it pay all the more. As for the revision of the Code, Prince Bismarck held strongly to the articles affecting the officials in the department of foreign affairs. He was bent on repressing such abuses as those for which Count Arnim had been condemned, and the Parliament voted the clauses that he recommended. In any other country, and conspicuously in France, such offences as Count Arnim's would be punished as malversation of national property. On this subject Prince Bismarck spoke with a passion that showed how deeply the Arnim affair had irritated him. He went so far as to say that without such means of repression, he could no longer consent to hold his office—a singular exaggeration, disclosing once more the inborn violence of that powerful organisation. A point worth noticing is that a proposal for the payment of members was adopted by a majority of two-thirds in the Reichstag.

The history of France ever abounds with the unforeseen. The election of 75 senators by the Assembly is an incident at once comic and serious. The fashion in which the Right was cheated of its hopes, and made the victim of its own intrigues, recalls the Day of Dupes. It has been justly punished for its exclusiveness. The coalition between the Left and the Light Horse, or Extreme Right, raises one of the most delicate points of political morality. Was such a coalition blameable? In the Left, at any rate, it was excusable enough, for the men of the Left sacrificed none of their principles, and they procured a great majority in favour of the maintenance of the Republic,—their one great aim and end. For the Light Horse, the case is more grave. As the *Univers* has rightly reproached

them, they were really surrendering the citadel to the enemy. Their line of argument was this. The Republic has fewer chances of stability than an Orleanist or Bonapartist monarchy. If the Republic should succumb in the convulsions of anarchy, France will be thrown into the arms of the Church and Legitimism. The Republic, therefore, is the shortest road from Frohsdorff to Paris. Whether this reasoning of the Light Horse be right or wrong, what is certain is that the majority gained by the moderate republicans in the Senate will give authority to that body, and introduce a certain balancing element into the constitution. If it had been wholly composed of conservatives and reactionists, it would at once have become unpopular, and its influence would have been null, as the influence of Upper Chambers in other times has always been null. An antagonism would have arisen between the two chambers, and this would inevitably have led to conflicts that would have disturbed the Republic and sooner or later provoked a revolution. In the departments even the most advanced republicans will stand as candidates for the Senate. The passionate Langlois lately said to the present writer :—" The Senate is an engine of war designed against the Republic : we ought to seize it, and use it for a citadel on behalf of the Republic." This programme is already partially realised. There is every probability that the departmental elections will go in the same direction. We need not speak here of the personal struggles that agitate the last moments of the expiring Assembly. It is amazing that foreign newspapers should be found ready to fill their columns with these pitiful intrigues, and that there should be readers idle enough to follow them.

The great event of the month has been the practical notification to Europe of a vital change in English official opinion. The first article in the programme of a serious statesman in England was the maintenance at any price of the Ottoman Empire. To-day, enlightened by experience, England recognises that she has been wishing what was impossible. It is no inconsiderable merit to know how to give way before evidence, and to be willing to profit by the teaching of facts. It is wrong therefore to reproach the English government for its change of tack, as the French newspapers are doing. English official opinion is only following French counsel as to the East. Saint Marc Girardin showed what our policy ought to be, in articles that were admirable for their clearness, and are well worth reading over again, now that events are confirming them point by point.¹ It is odd that the French should show spleen, simply because the English have adopted a policy which they themselves have been preaching for years.

The purchase of the Khedive's shares, considered by itself, has none of the importance that has been attached to it, either for England or for other states. As M. Lesseps has truly said, England has only taken the part in the Canal which she would certainly have taken at its beginning but for the mistaken opposition of Lord Palmerston. According to the French law upon joint-stock companies, such influence as the English government will be able to exercise on the decisions of the Company, will be very limited, unless recourse be had to subterfuges such as are wholly unworthy of a great government, and which were loudly and generally condemned when they were employed not long ago by a Belgian financier, who in this way got

(1) *Revue des Deux Mondes.*

control of the *Crédit Mobilier*. Even supposing the entire property of the Canal to pass into the hands of England, that would make no difference in the present situation. There would be no advantage for English ships, that would not be equally profitable to the marine of other nations at the same time. England would never close the Canal to a foreign vessel, nor would she ever dream of imposing differential rates. She has only one interest, to improve the Canal and to reduce the tolls. Suppose she were to widen the Canal to such an extent that powerful ships could pass one another at every point, and suppose that the tolls were reduced to the bare amount necessary for the maintenance of the Canal, what nation could fail to congratulate itself on such a result?

If this supremacy is not brought about, then notwithstanding her 176,000 shares, the influence of England will be at a minimum, exactly as M. Leroy Beaulieu maintains. In this case also nothing will be changed. Or else, the action of England will be real and effective, either in proportion to the shares that she has already, or to those which she may acquire in addition. Then that action, again, must necessarily tend to the increase of facilities of navigation.

The operation, then, is favourable all round; and for others more than for the English. England was bound to buy the shares that the Khedive threw into the market, in order to acquire the amount of ownership and control, that she ought to have taken at first. Germany and Italy acted on just the same principle in the St. Gothard tunnel. It has been maintained that it is unprecedented for a state to take an interest in a foreign industrial company. The case of the construction of the St. Gothard tunnel proves the contrary. Another instance: the Belgian² government has long possessed a portion of the shares of the Rhine Railway.

If we suppose the case of a war in which England should find herself involved, the acquisition of a part or even of the whole of the shares of the Canal would make not the slightest difference in the situation. Whether proprietor or not of the Canal, if England retains her supremacy at sea, it will be her first care to defend and keep open the road to India. And if she is worsted, the Canal will be closed to her, however many shares she may possess.

However this may be, there is no ground in any case for raising a shout of triumph as if the world were conquered. Such exaggerated applause is dictated by a sentiment which is very general in England, but which is very unfortunate, and may lead the country, and especially the government, into disastrous faults. Nothing can be more puerile than the desire to cut a figure in the eyes of Europe by giving proof of strength and decision at all hazards. Since 1854 England has taken no part in the wars of which Europe has been the stage. Neither the defeat of Denmark in 1864, nor that of Austria in 1866, nor that of France in 1870, drew her from her neutrality. She took the wisest course. In 1864, if she had made war in the interests of Denmark against Germany and Austria allied, she would have compromised the independence of Belgium, which Napoleon III. never ceased to dream of restoring to the Empire. In 1866 England was bound to lean towards Prussia and Italy rather than towards Austria, for the triumph of Austria would have been the triumph of Ultramontaniam. Finally in 1870, after the disclosure of the designs of conquest nourished

by Napoleon, she agreed with Prussia to resist those designs in case of need. How could she then have turned against Prussia, when that power had by its victories secured the very end which they had both been pursuing in common? No serious politician will maintain that England ought to have gone to war in 1864, or in 1866, or in 1870. Yet the French journals lose no opportunity of avenging themselves for English abstention by epigrams. Their gibes, incessantly repeated by the political simpletons of the continent, irritate the political simpletons in England, and, alas! here as everywhere else in the world, they form the great majority. They are ready to clap hands at any act of vigour which tends to prove that the country is not fallen. Consequently, a minister in search of something to revive his waning popularity has nothing to do but to intervene with a great bustle in foreign affairs, however miserable a blunder such intervention might happen to be. This is a grave danger: for even without thinking of keeping in office, an English minister will always be inclined to listen to the opinion of the country. This opinion is distorted by the morbid desire to rise from a purely imaginary condition of humiliation.

If the purchase of the shares is an act of no immediate importance in itself, the case is quite different when we think of the effect it may have in Europe. Its significance is profoundly ominous. Its reception by the public is taken to prove, in spite of all the words of Lord Derby, that England is ready in certain contingencies to seize Egypt. It is interpreted as if England were giving the signal for the partition of the Ottoman Empire by taking securities in advance. This is not the true view of the transaction. The 176,000 shares will not facilitate the seizure of Egypt. But, then, it is certain that the other states might find in what Lord Derby has done, a pretext and justification for the partial occupation of Turkey. It is the declaration of the opening of the succession to the inheritance, and England *seeming* to take her share, it is in a certain way to encourage the others to do the same. Lord Derby must have foreseen this, and if, notwithstanding that, he proceeded to act, it must have been because he had persuaded himself either that Russian covetousness is a myth, or else that *it could be repressed*. There is the important point.

The act of the English ministry must have displeased France and Russia and disquieted Austria, but gratified Germany. In reality the interests of France will suffer no harm. But it cannot be denied that it is a wound to the self-love of the French. All French parties feel it to be so; wrongly, perhaps, but their feeling is none the less keen. They perceive that France has less authority in the counsels of Europe and that she is isolated; this is naturally intensely bitter to them. France has nothing to hope from a partition of the Turkish Empire, but she has long been accustomed to consider Egypt as her dependent. It is not without sharp irritation that she sees it passing into the hands of the English. Russia must feel something of the same kind. She might perhaps rejoice at what seems like the signal for giving the final stroke to the Sick Man, but on two conditions only; first, that she should be ready to act, and next, that her neighbours should be willing to let her act. Do these conditions exist? We may well doubt. Assuredly Austria cannot acquiesce in Russia taking even so much as Bulgaria, even if they left to Austria all the western part of the

Balkan. For to annex Bulgaria, Russia must sooner or later have Roumania, and Austria would be thus cut off from the Black Sea, and locked fast within the clutch of the great Slavic colossus. It is her interest, therefore, with all her might to uphold the existing state of things.

Turning to Germany we see that her *permanent* interests are the same as those of Austria. She cannot desire to see Russia definitely established either on the Danube or at Constantinople. It is true that she may be willing to tolerate a good many things for the time in the East, for the sake of having her arms free in the West. In this lies the single danger that menaces the peace of Europe. Last May Europe only escaped war by the intervention of Russia and England. It was disagreeable to Germany to find in front of her an Anglo-Russo-Austrian coalition, resolved on preserving peace. Serious eastern complications would necessarily break up this coalition, for there would be a collision of interests between Russia, England, and Austria. Germany would then recover her freedom of action and could choose her allies. What Lord Derby has done, so far as it may prepare or hasten the crisis in the East, must have given pleasure to Germany. Whether it be true or not, as is rumoured, that the English cabinet informed the Berlin cabinet of its intention, it was at least only at Berlin that Lord Derby could have hoped to find complete approval of his project. What is rather curious is that the German newspapers, after a little hesitation at first, very soon found no words of praise and satisfaction too strong for the exploit of the English government.

If affairs came to a head in the East, Germany would have her choice between two policies and two systems of alliances. She may ally herself with Austria and England, to hold Russia in. Or she may ally herself with Russia to divide Austria, assured at a later period of being able to force Russia to evacuate Turkey and even the Principalities, by then acting in concert with England. But to carry out a policy on this great scale, with two parts and at long date, it would be necessary first to bring Russia to decided action. This cannot be easy, considering the pacific disposition of the Emperor and the prudence and foresight of Prince Gortchakoff. In any case it is plain that Lord Derby's purchase exactly suits the game of Germany. Its effect will be to draw together, on one side the two malcontents, France and Russia, and on the other side the two powers who are content, Germany and England. The friendliness between Russia and France is not at first likely to be of a very close kind, but it is certain to become so. So long as the views of Russia are only directed towards Asia, she may remain faithful to the German alliance. The moment she commences a serious enterprise in Europe, then a French alliance becomes indispensable. The more decisively England plants her power in Egypt, the greater umbrage will she give to France. This is just as unreasonable as it is inevitable. In spite then of whatever apprehensions and whatever antipathies some of her people may have, England must be more and more drawn towards Germany.

In a word, if what Lord Derby has done is connected with a plan of general policy embracing, *à longue échéance*, the whole Eastern Question, then it is justified, for such an act enters into such a plan. If it is an isolated act, designed to satisfy the puerile national vanity which seeks a

proof of energy at all hazards, then its disadvantages distinctly outweigh its advantages.

Turning to the present centre of agitation in the East, everyone is asking himself what will come to pass in the spring. The Turkish troops are still baffled by the rising of the Herzegovinians supported by their neighbours of the same tongue and the same creed. Servia and Montenegro seek to come to some understanding that will give them a ground for united action, and it is not to be supposed that they will passively watch the massacre of their brethren. The reforms with which the Porte has just presented its subjects seem adequate enough on paper, but nobody takes them seriously, because no one has any faith in the possibility of their realisation.

The attitude of the three Empires in the matter is most singular. Russia seems almost satisfied with the Sultan's concessions; the German press declares them to be perfectly illusory; while Austria would be contented with them, provided it were in her power to superintend their execution. Meanwhile, Russia and Austria continue to negotiate, with a view to discovering some mode of intervention that Turkey can accept, that may protect the rayahs, and that may satisfy the national Slavic sentiment which the two Empires have an equal interest in conciliating. Neither of the two can suffer the other to figure alone as declared champion of the rights of the oppressed Christians, for this would be to stand forth as saviour of the Slaves, and all the forces of Slavism would gravitate towards any power in such a position. They might adopt a policy of absolute non-intervention, and transform the Balkan Peninsula into a *champ-clos*, in which Montenegrins, Serbs, Bulgarians—all the Slaves, in short—should contend with the Turk, until either decisive victories or the exhaustion of the two combatants should have settled the question. This would perhaps still be the most humane plan, for there is less mischief to humanity in a war localised in Turkey, than in a great European conflict. But is it not inevitable that Russia and Austria should be drawn in, either by territorial ambition or by the necessities of the situation?

It is worth while shortly to endeavour to disentangle the various interests of the great powers. The general opinion in Europe is that Russia is bent on sooner or later taking Constantinople. We do not believe that Russia at the present moment has any wish to attempt such a conquest, though it is certain that Constantinople is a constant object of her dreams. A recent drawing in one of the comic papers at Berlin indicated the situation perfectly. On one side is seen a pine tree, among whose branches appears a Cossack's head. The snow descending in thick flakes covers the whole with a white shroud. On the other side by the seashore is a graceful palm, with a charming houri nestling at its feet. Underneath are written Heine's two famous stanzas:—

Ein Fichtenbaum steht einsam
Im Norden auf kahler Höh'.
Ihn schläfert; mit weisser Decke
Umhüllen ihn Eis und Schneec.

Er träumt von einer Palme,
Die fern im Morgenland
Einsam und schweigend trauert
Auf brennender Felsenwand.

Poets are unconscious seers, and it might seem as if these verses had been composed for a pithy summary of the Eastern Question.

On thinking over the various elements of the problem, we reach the conclusion, that Russia cannot definitively occupy Constantinople until she has destroyed Austria and annexed all its Slavic provinces. It is only a Pan-Slavic Empire that could carry its frontier to the Sea of Marmora. General Fадеев has proved to demonstration that a Russian army cannot plunge into the Balkan Peninsula, while exposed to a flank attack on the part of Austria, and sure of meeting the English forces in front of her. Hence the destruction of Austria is an absolutely indispensable preliminary. Suppose an agreement between Germany and Russia to dismember Austria; Prussia taking the German provinces and Bohemia, Hungary declared independent, and Russia taking for her share the whole of Turkey. In such a combination Russia would henceforth be at the mercy of the Germanic Empire; and the Germanic Empire leaning on England, and assured of the aid of Hungary, would cut Russia off from her new conquest by a simple flank march on the Danube. We may, then, affirm that the existence of the Germanic Empire bars Russia from the road to Constantinople. Until Russia has in her hands the Danubian Principalities, and until Hungary and Croatia, moreover, are completely assimilated in the Empire as a base of operations, she cannot cross the Balkan. A glance at the map, re-cast in the way indicated, is enough to show that the situation of Russia would be incapable of defence.

It would be of no avail for Germany to offer Russia the East, as she was said to have done last spring. Russia could not accept that dangerous gift; for she would only retain it on sufferance, and sooner or later it would be torn from her. The fruit is not yet ripe. If ever it is to be so, it will take at any rate a century, unless Germany be in the meantime completely crushed and reduced to impotence.

It is probable, therefore, that the policy of Russia is still that which Nicholas expounded to Sir Hamilton Seymour in 1853, in terms which are worth reproducing, because they go to the root of the question, and it is not often that we are able clearly to seize the precise notions of the cabinet of St. Petersburg. "I do not," he said, "cherish the illusions of Catherine II. on the subject of Constantinople; on the contrary I regard the vast extent of Russia as its only real danger. I should like to see Turkey strong enough to make herself respected by the other Powers. But if she is destined to perish, it is essential that Russia and England should come to an understanding to put something better in her place. I propose, then, that we should make of the Danubian Principalities, Servia, and Bulgaria, an independent State, placed under the protection of Russia, and I declare that Russia covets no domination over the Turkish possessions. England may take Egypt and Crete, but I cannot suffer her to establish herself at Constantinople, and I say this emphatically. On the other hand, I am ready to promise that *I on my side will never take Constantinople, if the convention that I propose is effected between England and Russia. If Turkey were to break up rapidly before the conclusion of this convention, and if it became necessary to take Constantinople, naturally I cannot engage not to do it.*"

If Nicholas did not wish to take Constantinople, still less is the Emperor

Alexander likely to think of it; for to-day with a mighty Germany on the flank, Russia is far more cramped in her action than when Germany was divided into little States, including among them Prussia, whose aims were widely divergent, and who all bowed before the Czar. Then the character of the present Emperor is a great guarantee for moderation. If he had been ambitious he could, in 1866, and still more certainly in 1870, have obtained from Germany as the price of his alliance, a greater gain than the opening of the Black Sea. Again, last spring, for the sake of his aid or even for simple freedom of movement, Germany would have made him the amplest concessions. He preferred to guarantee the maintenance of peace. All this shows how clearly Russia understands that the hour for great enterprises in Europe has not yet struck. To go from Moscow to Constantinople, the Czar would have to pass by Berlin and Vienna, and the moment for this circuit is not propitious. To break up German unity, and absorb the oriental provinces of Austria,—these are preliminary operations which must precede the march upon the Balkan, and they can only be attempted with the aid of France.

At the moment all points in this quarter to set fair. Prince Gortchakoff returning to St. Petersburg stopped at Berlin, and had long interviews with Prince Bismarck and with the Emperor William. Count Karolyi, the Austrian envoy, arrived on the eve of his departure, dined at Prince Bismarck's with the Russian chancellor, and the harmony prevailing among the three powers is said to be complete.

Austria, and still more Hungary, are far from desiring to round themselves off by a province of the Ottoman Empire. The Slaves are already in a majority in the Austrian States. The annexation of new territory, peopled exclusively by Slaves, would pave the way for their decisive preponderance. Still if intervention were necessary in Herzegovina, it would be for Austria to carry it into execution. She only can do so, without exciting the alarm of Europe or giving rise to grave complications. A combined intervention of Russians and Austrians would lead to dangerous *tiraillements*. We saw in 1866 what the combined occupation of Schleswig-Holstein by Prussia and Austria in 1864 brought about. The occupation, or still better, the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria would offer great advantages from the general point of view of civilization. Dalmatia is nothing but the shore of Herzegovina and Bosnia, and the coast can never be separated from the interior of a country without great mischief to both. Both regions suffer, and are checked in their development. The ports of Dalmatia, once so flourishing under the Roman Empire and even in the middle ages, are now, notwithstanding their sounding names, mere hamlets without a future. They have no relation with the districts behind them, whose products they ought to export. The interior is isolated and cut off from the sea, without any means of communicating with more civilized parts of the world. Imagine the two provinces united to Croatia and Dalmatia, as nature intended and as history indicates. The Austrian government would ensure the reign of peace, would free the rayahs without exposing the Mussulmans to their vengeance; the taxes, better assessed and more equitably levied, would serve to enrich the country with roads, bridges, and schools, instead of being swallowed up by the shameless prodigals of the Seraglio.

Hence the best solution of the oriental dead-lock would be for the Divan to adopt the project of reform which Count Andrassy has elaborated, and for the execution of it to be entrusted to Austria. A firm and intelligent governor, supported by a small force, would suffice to restore order and to open the way to a more cheerful future.

The affair of the Suez Canal has naturally, as we have said, been the sovereign object of attention. But by a singular paradox of the fates, the least imaginative of European nations is constantly having its interest touched and excited in events that are happening in the remotest parts of the earth, and yet concern us almost as closely as if they were taking place in Yorkshire or Connemara. We repeat every morning the lazy phrases as to the dulness of the journals. In truth, if one reads the *Times* with something of that attention that is given as a matter of conscience to the history of a more distant past, one might say that the variety and interest of affairs have hardly been greater in the present generation. All roads lead to England, as once all roads led to Rome, and in every quarter of the globe intrigue and civil debate, pageant and battle, are weaving new threads into the web of our imperial fortunes. The gossip of Levantine traders on the Golden Horn, the stir and trouble among the wintry mountains of Herzegovina, the intrigues of the Sultan's palace at Stamboul, affect us not any less than does the peevish agitation which is going on among our countrymen at the Cape of Good Hope. And then the portents and marvels of India are every day before our eyes. If a cynic may smile when he comes upon animated pictures of the royal patron of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals presiding over the furious snorts and bloody thrusts of a fight among elephants, rhinoceroses, buffaloes; or when he remembers the too courtly words in which the Tribune of the People expatiated on the stimulating incentive that the presence of the illustrious pleasure-seeker would furnish to the most active, able, self-denying, and industrious set of public servants that any State was ever fortunate enough to possess, still the scenes in India may well help to give our people a more vivid feeling about the vast diversity of races and nations, creeds and governments, customs, practices, and characters, that an unwelcome but overmastering destiny has given to us. On the other hand, there are already marked signs that the Prince's visit will leave behind it a multitude of embarrassments and a degree of unsettlement among chiefs and populations, which will assuredly not make our situation in India any less like sitting on the edge of a volcano than it was before.

Further east, the Malay Peninsula witnesses the re-telling of an old story. One reads with pure vexation of English redcoats and bluejackets driving Malays up their own rivers, sending rockets whizzing and crashing through jungle, and bursting in defence and stockade. Even if this were inevitable, it would be worse than inglorious work. So far from being inevitable it is only the result of action which the best opinion even in official circles pronounces thoroughly ill-judged. We interfere in affairs which do not concern us, we send officials to places where they have no business to be, the people of the country act just as we might have been sure that they would, and then the nation is committed to one more of these futile encounters. The worst of it is, that powerful influences are tending to commit us to a policy in China and elsewhere, that would lead avowedly and unmis-

takably to an indefinite augmentation of this bad work on a more wholesale scale. And we read with something stronger and more definite than mere vexation, of the firing of an undefended and guiltless village in the same expedition; of "young civil officers" arbitrarily burning down a Chinaman's house, for no better reason than that the Chinaman did not commit suicide by trying to rescue Mr. Birch from certain death (*Times*, Dec. 18). When performed in Europe, such exploits are denounced as atrocious; one would like to know why what is called barbarous and detestable in the Straits of Dover becomes righteous retribution in the Strait of Malacca? The mission to Yunnan to inquire into the death of Mr. Margary began its long journey from Hankow some eight weeks ago (Nov. 5), and we may fear that little save trouble and injustice is likely to follow. No sensible observer will wish to dwell too heavily on these things. The past has left us in a position of tremendous difficulty in face of these uncivilised communities. It is unavoidable that errors should be made by government, and many wrongs perpetrated by subordinates. But no occasion should be lost to call the attention of the country to the way in which we are going, and to impress on the thought of the country the urgent necessity of firmly establishing among the official classes at home and in the East definite principles of conduct, and shaping those principles on the right basis of justice and common sense.

Parliamentary speakers certainly do their best to make politics dull. At Bristol, at Bradford, at Sheffield, at Manchester, at Edinburgh, we are told half-a-dozen times in the month by Liberal chiefs and Conservative chiefs, that time is slumbering, the nation contented, the constituencies lethargic. Little incidents arise from day to day, little speeches are made each week, and they absorb the attention of the moment and pass away into oblivion as they so well deserve to do, and meanwhile men are taught to overlook the broad currents that are silently flowing toward them, bearing great questions and unknown forces. Our Conservatives hold their jubilant gatherings, and sing ungrudged psalms over the superiority of orderly England to disorderly France. But there is a disorder that is none the less hostile to the commonwealth-for being silent and not noisy; for being ashy-grey, not red. Pauperism and an extension of that form of socialism which we call Poor-Law Relief, and ever strengthening and widening habits of drunkenness, and the accumulation of land in fewer hands, and the cultivation by law of sectarian strife and passion, may work quite as serious mischief and waste in a state, as an occasional outburst of the "red fool-fury of the Seine." The great economic forces, the great spiritual forces, continue their resistless movement, though the Canutes of the two artificial parties of the parliament house sit on the shore and bid them stay.

People write and talk as if these questions were invented and made to fill the air, by the mere restlessness of aspiring politicians. "There is evidence," for example, the *Times* justly tells its readers (Dec. 16th), "that the disestablishment of the Church will now be pursued by a compact and vigorous body of men with determined pertinacity." But this compact body of men are only pressing a question which the very spirit of time has borne on into the front place. If they were silent, it would still be present to all men's minds. The agitation is the least factitious

of any political movement that has taken place in our time. It is the one subject on which you are most certain of having a crowded meeting in any large town in England. It is the one bond of union between the most important groups of liberals. Even the Tapers and Tadpoles of politics must admit, if they take the pains to count the contingents that may be confidently expected to join the party of a Free Church, that this party is rapidly becoming really formidable. It comprises practically the whole body of the Protestant Nonconformists, for though at present there may be one or two small groups who stand aloof, yet when the issue is drawn squarely, Nonconformists will act like other people and follow their leaders. The Wesleyans have hitherto refrained from action, but the infatuated pretension of privileged ecclesiastics in a recent notorious case have acted along with larger considerations in transforming the neutrality of this powerful connection into a willingness to strike hands with the earlier partisans of religious equality and spiritual freedom. Of the Catholics it is calculated by some of those who have the best means of knowing, and the least bias in their estimate, that though perhaps one third might shrink from joining a party so largely representing "the Protestantism of the Protestant religion," yet two-thirds would vote for the policy of taking away artificial advantages from a rival hierarchy. From within the church itself there are gradually coming allies of each of the three colours; sacramentalists weary of the Erastian bonds of parliament and the privy council; evangelicals, exasperated by State connivance with a Romanizing reaction; broad churchmen, who are beginning to see first, that the laity in a free church would hold the keys of the treasury, and would therefore be better able than they are now to secure liberality of doctrine in their clergy, and secondly, are beginning to see that the straining to make the old bottles of rite and formulary hold the wine of new thought, withers up intellectual manliness, straightforwardness, and vigorous health of conscience, both in those who practise these economies and in those whom their moderation fascinates.

As for the working classes, so far as this various and half inscrutable mass can be divined, the religious portion would follow the policy of the sect to which the individual happened to belong; the sots and vagabonds of the residuum would be led by Beer; while that portion which is not attached either to church or chapel, apart from personal or local considerations of accidental force, would certainly go for disestablishment. There is not a single leader of the industrial class with any pretence to a representative character—Messrs. Macdonald, Burt, Odger, Arch, Potter, Broadhurst, and so forth—who is not already strongly and distinctly pledged.

Taper and Tadpole may agree, on counting up the elements which have just been told, that even from their point of view the cause of a Free Church is so far from being the forlorn crusade of a handful of fanatics, that it is in fact a cause to which a greater number of liberals of all kinds may be expected to rally than to any other cause whatsoever. Its leaders in the country are among the most practical and practicable of men. They do not urge it for immediate settlement. As was said by one of them, "The question of Church disestablishment can wait until we have prepared the popular mind: if I could disestablish the Church to-morrow or to-night by holding up my little finger, I would keep my hand down. That is why

Lord Hartington was right in enjoining patience on his followers." (*Mr. Chamberlain at Sheffield*, Nov. 25.)

The new political movement is for the present extra-parliamentary. The directors of party strategy in the House of Commons are not asked nor expected to commit themselves to Free Land and Free Church. It is enough for the present if they refrain from committing themselves against those two great causes. It suits the Liberals of office and place to describe their half unwelcome friends as violent, fanatical, and extreme. Yet in fact they are accepting and acting upon the genuine Whig theory. The Whig method has always been to wait until the people forced this or that demand upon them; then they obtained or conceded it. The Whig leader follows. This is not epigram, but constitutional history. Lord Granville and Lord Hartington are of the old pattern, and those who are setting themselves to bring the Church and the Land into a front place, have so far no complaint to make against the two parliamentary heads of the party. They naturally prefer such men to the politicians whose notion of policy is to have some facile measure devised in London, and then the word passed to the local leaders to assemble great meetings of the people to shout for the new palladium, which is after all only a palladium of pinchbeck.

It is the latter method which makes our liberalism so sterile. Thus there is a certain readiness to denounce as high treason any attempt to question the expediency of identifying liberalism with electoral reform. And it is worth while to observe what happened at Manchester (Dec. 15). The conference of the National Reform Union was promoted by the more moderate Liberals, after consultation with members of Parliament of their own shade. The programme was drawn up with studied vagueness so as to discountenance all fanaticism, and in the expectation of securing the Radicals without committing the Whigs. The authors of this programme drew up a list of invitations to delegates who were to approve and adopt it. What happened? The delegates, not at all chosen from the extreme section, come together, and instantly proceed with one consent to substitute the most definite propositions for ingenious phrases in every case in which the meaning had been left doubtful. We venture to say that at any meeting of a thousand liberals called anywhere in England by anybody, the course of things would be precisely the same. The importance of electoral reform is not denied, and no one of the Advanced party has ever pronounced electoral reform to be unnecessary. But then no scheme of electoral reform is before the country. The mere inclusion of a million new voters of the old stamp is in itself no reform at all. The calculation is that the County Franchise Bill would give us 600,000 more voters in villages and towns, and 400,000 agricultural labourers. Those who cry that if we can only get an extension of the suffrage first, then redistribution of seats is sure to follow, forget that there is no chance of overcoming the interested opposition to redistribution save at the time of the popular excitement that might be aroused by an agitation for extended suffrage. This is shown by the fact that although it was repeatedly said by both parties in 1867 that household suffrage in boroughs would certainly be followed by a comprehensive measure of redistribution, the question of redistribution at once dropped almost entirely out of notice.

Even in a wider field than pure administration, neither of the two elder parties has any final monopoly of breadth of view or skill of legislation. This is what Mr. Chamberlain says of one of the main acts of last session, of which he has had such excellent means of judging :—

“ Self-government has almost infinite capacities for good, and those capacities have been recognised boldly and courageously by a Conservative Administration. We owe it to Mr. Cross and to Mr. Booth at the present time that we have a bill which, I do not hesitate to say, is the most radical measure which has been passed during the last twenty years. For the first time almost in the history of this country the claims of great communities have been recognised as superior to individual rights and the sacred rights of property. Once in a way, at all events, the health, and the lives, and the comfort, and the happiness of the people are reckoned as something better worth saving than the pecuniary interests of the landlords. Now, in the bill to which I am referring, the Artisans' Dwellings Act of last session, there are some bad clauses; and I spoke to Mr. Cross about them. I pointed to one especially conceived in the interests of the landlords, and said, ‘ That is a blot upon your bill.’ Mr. Cross said, ‘ That is due to the action of your friends in the House of Commons.’ It is a fact that at the present time the Radical town of Birmingham, which is engaging in a gigantic enterprise under this Act by which we hope to give comfortable dwellings and pure homes to 40,000 of our artisan population, owes more to the enterprise and to the breadth of view of a Conservative administration, than it owes to the efforts of those who ought to have been its friends in the House of Commons ” (Sheffield, Nov. 25). •

It is not we who can rightly be called the revolutionary or destructive wing of the party, when we urge liberals to think of ends as well as means; of the political work to be done no less than of the machinery with which to do it; of good government and the objects of political duty more than of political rights. It is said by those who know Lancashire—to take that important county as an illustration—that the old type of hard-headed radical is almost extinct among the workmen in the factory towns. The northern radical was not the profoundest of sociological adepts, but he had patriotism and public spirit and national interest. He is said to be replaced by a generation who care solely for material interests, and for those only within a very narrow sphere. The deterioration is not surprising, and it is due to several separate causes. But one of them certainly is the thin and unfruitful quality of the Suffrage question, which was the chief element in the political instruction of the new generation. And we are now worse off than ever. Such restriction of a programme as is now insisted upon, has never been known before. In 1832 representative reform was expressly associated with a large number of most important reforms of other kinds. Even in the agitation which led to the Reform Act of 1867, ends were not entirely left out of sight. The machinery was to be readjusted with a view to certain definite objects beyond. There was a list of ultimate aims for which, and which only, the battle of the suffrage was worth fighting. The disestablishment of the episcopal church in Ireland, a land act for Ireland, the abolition of Purchase in the Army, an Education Act—it was the prospect of these things which interested the best men in securing the indispensable changes in the electoral machinery. Let us reform our electoral machinery by all means, but let us understand and make others understand that we only seek this because we seek something else :—the disestablishment of the episcopal church in England; the reinvigoration of local public life, both in town and country, by the attribution of higher functions to local public

bodies; the emancipation of the land from artificial restrictions; the erection of a system of gratuitous primary instruction. There is no disorder, no confiscation, no revolution in all this: it is the line of passage from sentimental radicalism to scientific liberalism. As to the land, the restitution of true Ownership to the man whom our present artificial system of settlement reduces to a mere limited and burdened Possession, marks a true respect for the rights of property on the part of those who make the proposal. As for the disendowment of the Church, we venture to predict that when the scheme which is known to be in preparation is publicly launched, many of its supporters will, like Clive, stand aghast at their own moderation.

With reference to the last point, as the question of endowments is pretty sure to be a main issue in more than one part of the great struggle that is coming, it may be well to quote the authority of an eminent conservative politician. In his inaugural speech at Edinburgh,—which, in spite of some rather singular merits, still had considerable flavour of the famous academic discourse with which Mephistopheles in the play, in rectorial cap and gown, so amazed, perplexed, and depressed the Scholar,—Lord Derby went so far as to say:—

“I do not agree with those who say that the State has no right to divert endowments from one purpose to another. To my mind, so far as right is concerned, the Legislature may do what it chooses in regard to any endowment, without injustice, provided only that the rights of living individuals are respected. How far it is politic to use that power is another matter. Men give or leave funds, not for the promotion of useful public purposes in the abstract, but for some special form of public usefulness that has taken their fancy. One man cares for schools, another for hospitals, and so forth; and unless intending benefactors have a reasonable security that the general purpose for which they leave their money will be respected, the stream will soon dry up. More than that, I consider, they ought not to ask. Respect the founder's object, but use your own discretion as to the means; if you do not do the first, you will have no new endowments; if you neglect the last, those which you have will be of no use” (Dec. 17).

As to the likelihood of a rational dealing with old endowments acting to dry up the stream of new ones, we may call Lord Derby's attention to the case of Bradford, where a root and branch resettlement of the old educational endowments of the town has been immediately followed by contributions of a splendid sum to augment them, from a munificent inhabitant of the town. Sir Josiah Mason's enormous gifts at Birmingham, and the endowments just conferred on Hertford College at Oxford, serve to show on a still larger scale how little the plain and unmistakable certainty of a future revision weakens the force of a beneficent intention. However, Lord Derby's words will be worth remembering, when we come to deal with such politicians as Mr. Bentinck, who is so impressed with the existence of “a faction bent on destroying Church, Rights of Property,” etcetera, as to warn the people of Whitehaven of the possibility of a time coming “when the good sense and commerce of the country would even look to the intervention of *arbitrary power* as a relief from the dangers and disasters,” etcetera (Dec. 12). Decidedly, there are depths of political folly even below French Legitimism.

"If you speak with the absurdest Englishman on politics," said Heine, who, however, had not read Mr. Bentinck's speech of this month, "he is sure to say something reasonable, but as soon as the conversation turns on religion, then the cleverest Englishman will bring out nothing but absurdities." This is a mournful saying for us who are now just being drawn, perhaps for the rest of our natural lives, into the turmoil of ecclesiastical politics. And we already feel how true Heine's word is. The issue is political, yet it is sufficiently coloured with religion to reduce even the cleverest Englishmen to bring out the most sorrowful absurdities. One liberal friend, perhaps with higher gifts of sympathy than in the way of analysis, rushes with the fine chivalry of imperfect knowledge into the fray with fascinating commonplaces about individualism and rights of conscience, which are as helpful in our present struggle as would be the most charming waltz by Gung'l in solving a quadratic equation. We are urged by all our respect for freedom and conscience to accept the Canadian system. Now this plan was not quite correctly described by Mr. Forster (Bradford, Nov. 22). It is this. If any number of citizens choose to declare themselves dissentients, they are at liberty to elect three trustees. The trustees then have the power of settling the amount required for their schools; this amount they assess on the members of their communion, and levy under State authority, with the usual powers in cases of non-payment. What is this but to lend the power of the State for the purposes of a system of concurrent sectarian endowment? What you are asked to do is to allow the clergyman or the priest practically to assess and lay a school-rate on his congregation, with power of distraining the goods of a defaulter or a recalcitrant. The idea of such a project being accepted even by the present Parliament is too childish, nor will any number of columns of ever so agreeable Gung'l waltz music make it one whit less so. Mr. Forster is certainly no enemy of the sectarian schools; yet even he has now taken up the position that there should be no increase of State grants to sectarian schools, and that nothing should be done to encourage dogmatic teaching in Board schools (Speech of Nov. 22).

It is interesting in the light of our own discussions to observe that the fires of the same controversy that smoulders here, are in full blaze in the United States. But Congress is one stage in front of Parliament. The Senate and the House have passed Mr. Blaine's amendment to the Constitution (Dec. 14), enacting that "no money raised by taxation for the support of public schools or derived from any public fund therefor, shall ever be under the control of any religious sect; nor shall any money so raised ever be divided between religious sects or denominations." As soon as this has been ratified by the Legislatures of the States, it will become part of the organic law of the land. The next step, the restriction of the instruction in the common schools to secular knowledge, will evidently give rise to a more serious agitation. President Grant recommends a measure in this direction; and he also urges the abolition of the exemption of church property from taxation. The discussion will unluckily not be conducted on its merits, being mixed up with the great electioneering question whether the President is to have a third term of office. But the whole movement in the United States is a rehearsal of what we have to do in Great Britain.

A curious attack on one section of the advocates of a National, as distinct from a Sectarian, system of elementary instruction, has been made from a quarter where the grosser fallacies of logic have hitherto been uncommon. Writers who have taught us to expect better things from them, have been suddenly anxious to show that if a man happens to reject popular theology, therefore when he seeks to confine instruction in the public elementary schools to knowledge as distinguished from mystery, he can have no other possible motive than a desire to push his own negations. These writers expressly and in terms decline to beg the question by saying that such persons oppose theological instruction *because* they hold no religious views of a recognised kind. Why, then, may they not as citizens hold the same views about elementary instruction as President Grant or M. Gambetta from the same motives? Political motives for opposing religious instruction in State schools are certainly possible, because such opposition is common enough among those who are pure politicians. Why are men to be arbitrarily cut off from access by these motives, because they hold certain opinions about popular theology?

The discussion is only kept alive by a verbal confusion. Secularist is used in two senses. It means one who deliberately and positively repudiates theology; and it also means one who wishes for given reasons to relegate theological teaching to the family and the churches. The one is a positive term; the other privative. But it is wonderfully convenient for the polemical purposes of the ecclesiastical party to assume that the terms are exactly co-extensive; that those who, for given reasons of a civil kind, seek to leave something out, are really insisting on putting something in; and that the parent to whose child the State gives instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic, has a right to talk about a hurt conscience because the State does not also add to the gift something else as well.

But this attempt to exclude anybody who rejects the popular theology from political action in the most important of modern controversies is interesting and significant. When Mr. Mill's book on Liberty appeared, some people said that it was superfluous. Perhaps, as the impending ecclesiastical struggles proceed, some of us will find out that that wise and noble protest was very far indeed from being superfluous. One sometimes is tempted to consider to what extent, after all, Liberalism is more than skin-deep in Britain. Consider the election which has just taken place in East Aberdeenshire (Dec. 28). A liberal candidate has been rejected, first, for being a Unitarian, second, because he would not deny (when asked) that he thought it contrary to the principles of religious equality to bind the office of Chief Magistrate of the State to Protestantism, and third, because he held that if people are invited into taverns to get drunk on Sundays, they ought also to be invited into picture galleries to refresh themselves on Sundays. If anyone will be at the pains to read the full account of the proceedings at Fraserburgh and Peterhead, he will perceive all too clearly that it is at his own proper peril that any man brings the wine of a too generous liberalism to that "Thyestean banquet of clap-trap" in which the souls of too many of our electors so greatly rejoice.

THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

NO. CX. NEW SERIES.—FEBRUARY 1, 1876.

OUR DEALINGS WITH EGYPT, AND THE POSSIBLE RESULTS.

THE Ministry has not thought proper to give full explanations on the subject of its recent transaction with the Egyptian Government before the meeting of Parliament at the ordinary period, but we have a French official publication and several fragmentary ministerial utterances. It seems hardly likely that the statements in Parliament will add very materially to the main facts which have been already disclosed; the Government must necessarily be very reserved as to political eventualities. It appears, then, not out of place to try to take some account of the general situation in connection with the transaction, before its details are debated. And both because it is with a view to our interests in India that the step has been taken, and because Egypt seems in many respects very closely to resemble an Indian province, I wish to look at the matter more especially from that Indian side with which I have some familiarity.

Whether the measure adopted by the Ministry be right or wrong, I cannot but think that the tone of undoubting and exulting approval, taken by so large a portion of the press, is evidently, and on the face of it, unreasonable. Whatever conclusion we may come to, the matter is beset with difficulties and doubts. The press declared itself while yet the public had formed no opinion whatever. The so-called popular opinion is yet only skin deep. Every one who conversed with many others when the surprise came out must feel that ninety-nine men out of a hundred had taken no side till they read their newspapers.

The facts seem to be simple enough. Owing to our distrust of and opposition to the Canal scheme, almost the whole of the shares offered to the public fell into foreign, principally French hands, and the Canal Company, though properly subject in Egypt to Egyptian laws, has its head-quarters in Paris. On the other hand, it turns out that

we make by far the greatest use of the Canal, and are in that sense interested in it beyond all other nations put together. There is nothing to prevent an English public abounding in money, and at last convinced of the use and great future of the Canal, from remedying the national mistake of former years, by buying shares in the market. But it may be gathered that, owing to the French location, French surroundings, and French management of the Company, a movement of this kind had not yet set in, and the shares were little known and quoted in London.

The Khedive had retained a large proportion of the shares, but had parted with his right to dividends up to the year 1894. He was terribly in want of funds, and was anxious to sell his remaining interest in the shares. That interest had been offered to French capitalists on terms far more favourable than those afterwards given by our Government—viz., for about three and a half millions sterling, on which interest was to be paid by the Khedive till 1894, at 10, 11, or almost any other rate. The offer, however, was not accepted, and so far it cannot be said that the purchase by the British Ministry was immediately necessary. In fact, the distrust of Egyptian finance was so great, that, as respects the part of the bargain which depended on the payment of interest by Egypt, no one was likely to advance the money. Still, the deferred shares had a certain value (about £1,500,000, it seems to be calculated); as one of the last available assets they were being hawked about, and would probably be sold. Since the chief market for such shares was in Paris, they would probably have fallen into French hands. Under those circumstances, our Government stepped in, and gave far better terms than those declined by the French capitalists: four millions, and the money to be advanced on the Khedive's credit, at 5 per cent.

The transaction has two aspects, the commercial and the political. No doubt it would be a very inconvenient situation that the property in the Canal should remain chiefly French, while the customers who use it are chiefly English; a conflict of interests might arise, and possibly some antagonism. It is uncertain when this might be remedied by English purchases in the market. If, then, the Government had simply purchased the deferred shares at their value, or had even given for them a good deal more than their value (the penalty for the mistake we had previously made), I for one should have been inclined to say, "It is a very difficult question; there are obvious inconveniences and dangers attending the position; but the Government was in the best position to judge; I have a certain admiration for the pluck that takes such a responsibility; and at any rate, if it is thought better not to hold the shares, we can put them on the market again, and try to do so in such a way as to make them popular with English buyers." So far, I should not have ventured

on criticism pending the Government explanations; and I do not propose to pursue this branch of the subject farther at present.

But the political aspect of the question cannot be kept out of view. It is not only that results may follow which cannot be officially discussed; there is something much more direct and immediate than that. It seems to me that too much has been said of the purchase of the Canal shares, and too little of that which is politically much more important—viz., that we have directly subsidised the Khedive. We have lent him £4,000,000 for nineteen years at 5 per cent., when he could not get a smaller sum at 11 per cent., or any other per cent. This it is which gives the proceeding its greatest importance. This great subsidy, taken in conjunction with the deputation to Egypt of a body of high English officials, to inquire into the condition of Egyptian finance, looks very like a kind of financial protectorate of Egypt. The power of the purse is everything, and a financial protectorate would be nothing short of a political protectorate. It did, indeed, at first appear that we had very speedily, effectually, and so far beneficially, exercised the power thus newly acquired, to stop dangerous and expensive Egyptian aggressions in Africa. The withdrawal from campaigns against Zanzibar and Abyssinia seemed to be the first fruits of our influence. Whether this really is so, we shall know presently.

Postponing, however, for the present, the general question whether it is desirable that we should exercise a great political influence in Egypt, the doubt which I wish first to suggest is whether, in a country situated as is Egypt at this moment, a financial protectorate is not the worst and most dangerous form of protectorate.

Let us see the situation in which we are placed. From the part of the arrangement which amounts to an advance of money to the Khedive we cannot go back. We might sell the shares, as Lord Sandhurst suggested, with an undertaking on our part to pay interest to 1894; but this would still leave our interest to recover from the Khedive. As between him and the British Government we cannot recede, we must either recover the interest from him or lose it. We hear nothing of any material guarantee for this interest. If there were such a guarantee, it would amount to our taking a part of Egypt in pledge. If there is no such guarantee, then we can only rank with the other creditors; and it comes to this, that we have embarked in the same boat with them—with them we must sink or swim. We could hardly, in that case, use our influence to obtain payment for ourselves while they remain unpaid. No wonder that Egyptian stocks rose rapidly in the market as soon as it was known that the British Government had made this arrangement with the Khedive, and that they fell as rapidly when there came rumours of a hitch in the arrangement. If Mr. Cave and his staff

are not to interfere seriously in Egyptian finance, if they are only to teach the Egyptians English book-keeping and such pretty things, we have simply become ordinary Egyptian bondholders, without the promise of high interest to set against the risk. If Mr. Cave is to interfere seriously, that interference is naturally construed to be our taking in hand the liquidation of the Egyptian concern. That would be a very difficult job. It would be very likely to end in the accumulation of debt to us; possibly in the necessity for fresh advances to save the concern, and in a growing mortgage on the country which it might be very difficult to settle without foreclosing.

To the Khedive, in one way, British supervision and British advice may be very useful, but in another way our interference is disadvantageous to him, inasmuch as it makes his creditors much more difficult to deal with. Each will then have his pound of flesh, and nothing less, according to the letter of his bond. The debts contracted on terms necessitated by need and bad security will be demanded from the solvent mortgagee who has undertaken the management of the affair. The creditors will seek the combined benefit of bad security and good security—usurious terms and complete fulfilment of them. All that has gone into the pockets of financiers, all the abatements from full price conceded to float the loans, all the high interest, and everything else, go to swell the account far beyond the benefit the Khedive has actually received. There would be a state of things with which we are very familiar in India, when native debts come to be settled by our intervention. In India we are or have been strong enough to make some equitable compromise, but can we so deal with the European money markets? If the Khedive were left to himself, he is, to a certain extent, master of the situation. There is no court in which he can be sued and sold up. If the estate on which advances have been made on usurious terms really cannot pay, then the creditors must take as much as they can get. The man who engages in such risky transactions is well repaid if he really gets something short of his full account. In short, in the event of a breakdown and a stoppage of further loans, the Khedive might compromise with his creditors on terms more favourable than we could do so for him.

To revert to the main object of this paper: we have avowed the maintenance of a passage through Egypt to be a vital principle of our national policy; our Government has intervened in the affairs of the Khedive, lent him money, and purchased a large share in a great Egyptian property; all the world has taken these proceedings to amount to putting on Egypt a sort of British car-mark, signifying that come what may, if the country is loosed from its present Sovereign-in-chief, we must have a large share in its dis-

posal and management. These latter ideas may or may not be carried more or less far in the minds of individual British statesmen. They are probably not formulated into a definite policy of the Government or of any other party; but, nevertheless, there is no saying how far things may drift in that direction. The Turkish empire may break up; the military power and financial position of Egypt are not sufficient to enable her to stand alone without guidance or protection; it may become a pressing question under what superior control Egypt is to be placed. One very great power has already on a former occasion offered Egypt to England. Some other powers might not dislike such an arrangement. A decision may any day be forced on us. In some political affairs it may be well to let things drift; but when so great responsibilities and so onerous obligations may by the course of events be thrust on us, it is well not to drift into them blindly, but rather to see in what position such a course might land us, and to steer accordingly. I by no means suggest that we are likely to assume any suzerainty over Egypt; but I do wish to consider, in case such an eventuality should become possible, what sort of a prospect the arrangement would afford. If it would be a danger and embarrassment we ought not to do anything which might bring us nearer to it.

I will not attempt to deal with the question as one of European politics, and especially as regards the interests and feelings of France, which would be the great difficulty—with that part of the subject I have no special capacity to deal. But I try to form some idea what kind of an undertaking Egypt, considered as if it were an Asiatic State, would be in case it were thrust upon us by events. In so treating the matter it is only necessary to bear in mind that the situation of Egypt, isolated from Asia and comparatively near Europe, would render necessary a much stronger military force than if it could be attached as an additional province to our existing Indian empire.

Looking at the matter then from the Asiatic side, although our information regarding the population, finances, &c., is not precise, I think we have enough to show pretty clearly that, the debt apart, Egypt would not be a bad or unprofitable country to govern. The people are evidently not a proud and independent people—they have been subject to foreign rule for some three thousand years, much longer even than the Hindoos; and the revenues are very large compared to the cultivable area and the population. Behind Egypt, too, there are magnificent possibilities in Africa. I will first look at the finances, for that must after all govern all things.

First, and chiefly, Egypt has that grand Asiatic financial advantage, that the rent (so far at least as it represents the unearned increment) is reserved as the State-fund, and supplies a public revenue sufficient

to defray most of the public expenses. Situated as the country is, so near to European markets, and with a soil of great fertility constantly renewed by a natural manure from the river, the land revenue is very large. In the last statement, put forward apparently on authority, I find that the ordinary land-tax and cognate tithe on date-trees amount to about four and a half millions sterling. This alone would give, from 5,000,000 of people, a land revenue larger than that drawn from the best provinces in India, with a population many times more numerous; thus Bengal, with a population of 65,000,000, land revenue £3,900,000; North-West Provinces, population 31,000,000, land revenue £4,176,000; Madras, population 31,000,000, land revenue £4,354,000. It is stated, too, that the ordinary land revenue is at the rate of about £1 1s. 2d. per acre, which would be about ten times the average Indian rate.

Moreover there is a further land revenue entered under the head of "Mokabilah" (but which all statements agree to be an impost on the land), which amounts to upwards of a million and a half, thus giving altogether a land revenue of upwards of 6,000,000 sterling; an amount, derived from so small an area and population, enough to make an Indian financier's mouth water. I should have supposed the extra impost on the land to be a surcharge, such as is common in almost all native States in India, where the actual land revenue is generally made up of an original revenue and extra charges. But a recent occasional correspondent of the *Times* gives an explanation, making the extra land revenue very temporary in its character. I shall notice that shortly.

The other sources of revenue are equally Asiatic in their character. There is no opium revenue, and for the sake of our Indian interests we must hope there never will be. A Government salt monopoly there is, yielding about £300,000, or, if we add a further monopoly of, or tax on, salt fish, £375,000. This gives a rate per head (supposing the estimate of population to be approximate to the truth) of about double the rate of the Indian salt-tax; but it is still far less in proportion than the land revenue.

Further, the Khedive has tried a tax often proposed in India—a tax on tobacco—which has not yielded so much as was expected, but seems to have brought in £257,000.

Then there is the system of trade licenses, the old "moturpha," at one time universal in India and in most Asiatic countries, but piece by piece abolished by us. This yields in Egypt £412,000.

The customs yield £624,000, about one-fourth of our Indian customs, from about one-thirtieth of the population—again a revenue very much larger in proportion.

The remaining revenues consist of miscellaneous items, not very clearly distinguished; revenues of what we should call non-regula-

tion provinces, stated in the lump; octroi, municipalities, and other items which we should possibly class under local taxation; and the income from certain public works, locks, bridges, &c., and, above all, railways. The net income of State railways is now put down at something approaching a million sterling. If this account is given with any accuracy, the Egyptian railways must be among the most profitable in the world, but we have no exact information on this point.

Altogether the authorised statement gives an Egyptian revenue of upwards of ten and a half millions sterling. If we allow of this, one and a half millions as the revenue of municipalities, public works, &c., not usually included in State revenue proper, we shall still have nine millions of public revenue. Assuredly an indigenous government, with such an income at its disposal, *with* decent management, and *without* the unhappy power of extravagant borrowing, ought to be well off in the extreme. The tribute to Turkey is a cheap relief from the liability to foreign war. Apparently the Khedive should have been one of the most prosperous rulers in the world.

When we look to the other side of the account, we find that it is entirely his indebtedness which renders his position so far otherwise. Mr. Cave will probably give us more precise information than we now have regarding the debt, but the statement to which I have referred admits to a charge of nearly six and a half millions for interest of debt, fixed and floating. Thus, out of a total revenue of ten and a half millions, nearly six and a half go at one blow for interest on debt alone, leaving a little more than four millions for all the expenses of government, municipalities and public works included.

Nevertheless the expenses of government are put down at such moderate sums, that the account is made to balance—

The tribute to Turkey is	£668,000
The Khedive's civil list and the allowances to members of his family, so far as can be made out (some of the family allowances are mixed up with the civil departments), about	600,000
The whole of the civil departments, provinces regular and irregular, prefectures, municipalities, &c., about £1,100,000, or including extraordinary expenses in Darfour	1,300,000
Army	700,000
Marine (including a new ship of war), and several other administrations not distinguished in the accounts	500,000
Public works	368,000
Total	£4,136,000

or a little less than the net income.

If this account were quite correct and exhaustive, we may presume that the Khedive would not be in his present difficulties. We might expect that it must be in some respects too sanguine. But more than this, it is *radically* altered if the occasional correspondent of the *Times*, to whom I have alluded, is correct in a statement he makes regarding a public matter which must be perfectly well known. He says that the £1,575,000 which figures in the accounts of recent years as an extra impost on the land, called "Mokabilah," is the amount raised in pursuance of a decree issued in 1871, by which all landowners who should pay double land-tax for six years were to be freed from half the tax for ever. If this is so, then very shortly the revenue will lose—

Mokabilah	£1,575,000
Half of above remitted for ever	787,500

£2,362,500

or a good deal more than half the net revenue now available.

It seems very difficult to believe that, if this really were the fact, the Khedive's Government would put forward a statement which would amount to an open confession of utter bankruptcy. We may hope that such patent facts as these, Mr. Cave will at any rate ascertain and report.

Especially interesting and instructive it will be if Mr. Cave can throw real light on what is in truth the crucial question of Egyptian finance, viz. how far the borrowed money has been spent on *bond-fide* reproductive works. The money spent on the Suez Canal was well spent for the human race, if not to the profit of the Khedive; and, if there is any substratum of truth in figures, the present Egyptian railways cannot be a very bad speculation. But whether the great agricultural works, of which so much is said—the irrigation canals and other enterprises—in any degree pay, we do not know. It would certainly be unjust to take credit for revenue really due to these sources, and not to acknowledge that those who lent the money, and those who thus spent it, have acted fairly by the country. It will be, however, very far from an easy task to unravel the accounts, and clear up the question, how much money has been well spent, and how much wasted or plundered. We well know the difficulty from our experience of similar questions in India. To this day, after endless disputations, the official world there is not agreed how far the great works of irrigation pay. If there is so much difficulty in settling this among our own officers in India, it is very clear that to do it in Egypt, in a foreign land, amid the conflict of interested people, will be a task of the utmost difficulty, requiring the special knowledge of experts in these matters, and a great deal of firmness and judgment besides. Whether Mr. Cave's party are equal to the

task remains to be seen. It is very much to be hoped that they will not be led to follow any one-sided representations, but will give us only as much as they can learn surely and clearly. If it should prove that most of the money has really been well spent, we must have much sympathy for the Khedive, even if he has been led by projectors into some expensive mistakes. If most of it has been thrown away, we may well leave him to settle with the amiable gentlemen who advanced the funds.

I have said that the people of Egypt appear to be so well accustomed to a foreign rule that they are not difficult to govern. Though the Turks have long held dominion over Egypt, I understand that they are still to the native Egyptians entirely foreigners; they have not colonised but ruled in Egypt, somewhat as we do in India. The modern Egyptian language and civilisation is Arab, not Turk. The mere fact that the Khedive holds the country with an army which, including his frontier conquests and expeditions, does not figure more largely in his budget, is evidence that the people are quiet and submissive. It is indeed notorious that they have submitted to great hardships in the way of forced labour and other oriental exactions. Every line that one reads, and all that one sees and hears of Egyptian modes and habits, remind one of India.

Although the Egyptians have received an Arabic language and religion, it does not appear that they have taken the Arab character and spirit of independence. They cannot be at all like either the real Arabs whom we know in India as mercenaries, or the half-bred Arabs, the Moplahs, who have given us so much trouble, when excited by agrarian disputes, on the west coast of India. Religion would probably not stand in the way of those who would deal justly by them.

I venture to think that in speaking of Mahommedans we are still sometimes a good deal influenced by religious intolerance. There is a great disposition to seize on anything that can be twisted into Mahommedan "fanaticism." In the old days great things were no doubt accomplished by Arab energy and religious zeal; but among the races converted by political influences the faith does not generally take a fanatical form. In India I am confident that it does not. The Mahommedan empire which preceded us was notoriously tolerant and liberal in the highest degree; and, considering their position as lately dominant, and now placed in many respects at a disadvantage, the bulk of the Indian Mahommedans are marvellously peaceful and good subjects. When the various occasions on which some Mahommedan religious element has been imported into civil or political strife in India are examined, it will generally be found that religion has merely become an incidental bond to supplement an

agitation on political questions. Agrarian disputes have been in fact at the bottom of almost all such cases. Even on the frontier the Pathans are generally the loosest of Mahommedans; the fanatic zeal which troubled us was confined to a very small corner.

It may then, I think, be taken as the practical result of experience, that the mere adoption of the Mahommedan religion by a people not politically unruly does not necessarily make them fanatic and difficult to rule. So long as they have not substantial grievances and there is no interference with their religion, there is nothing to prevent their being good citizens and good subjects. All prejudice apart, one cannot but see that the religion has a very good effect on the conduct and character of the people as compared to any Pagan religion. A respect for the will of God is made more prominent than among many professing Christians, and in the matter of drink and deportment they have considerable advantages over us. They carry the belief in the equality of man into practice as very few Christian peoples do. Even as regards Turkey, one cannot read the reports of our consuls as a whole, setting one against the other and weighing them as an official man is accustomed to weigh such reports, without feeling that the Mahommedans are now almost as much sinned against as sinning. There is very little evidence of popular fanaticism under circumstances which give much occasion for irritation to the dominant race. It is not from fanaticism that the Christians of Turkey (whose position is in some respects curiously like that of Hindoos under Mahommedan rule in India) now suffer, but from the inefficiency and feebleness of the administration, and the financial extravagance begotten by European temptations. The Turks are evidently quite unequal to the very difficult task of governing a country internally divided by race, religion, laws, and manners; and they have got hopelessly into debt. But the ordinary Mahommedan population suffers from these evils just as much as the Christians. In Egypt, I take it that the fact that most of the people are Mahommedans is no insuperable objection to a closer connection with that country on the part of a strong and capable power.

Behind Egypt is Africa. The civilisation and utilisation of Africa is the great enterprise of the future, and it seems pretty clear that the only present available entrance to what may be called "High Africa" is by way of Egypt. In South Africa we come in contact with the Kaffirs, the most warlike and unsettled and least laborious of African races. There is no prospect on that side of a settled and progressive native dominion in Africa to be reached by other than very slow steps. On the west coast our settlements are separated from the interior by difficult and unhealthy jungles. The line of the east coast is held by Portuguese and Zanzibarees, who are not equal to a great enterprise. On the north the Desert separates the outer fringe from the interior.

We know enough to be assured that a strong and civilised power commanding Egypt may open up easy communication with, and navigation of, the great Lake region which occupies the centre of the African continent—a rich country of great capabilities, elevated several thousand feet above the sea, and the possessors of which, if sufficiently strong and organized, would dominate the bulk of the continent. Seeing how admirably fitted for labour the African race have shown themselves to be, how wretched and miserable is their condition in their own country under a barbarous anarchy and bloody slave-dealing customs, and how tractable, amiable, and good-tempered they are under civilised control, one cannot doubt that any great power which could and would perform for Africa the functions which we have performed in India, would immensely benefit the human race. And profitable as has been the labour of Africans in other continents under all the disadvantages of limited numbers, slavery, and a degraded position, it must be that the great native population of Africa would add prodigiously to the resources of the world in their own fertile continent, if, political order being maintained, personal freedom and security were guaranteed to them, and European energy and capital were introduced to direct free labour. The high Lake country in particular appears to be eminently fitted for such a settlement—healthy, fruitful, and fitted both for native and European residence. At the present time some of the most profitable productions in the world are those only produced in the peculiar climate afforded by the combination of a tropical latitude with an elevation which secures against great heat and malaria. Such a climate is insufficiently available elsewhere; in Africa there is a vast extent of it. Already the best coffee comes from High Africa, and pepper, quinine, and many other things would be abundantly produced there. Following the course of the many rivers which radiate from this elevated region, tropical countries of great richness and large populations would be reached as they cannot be reached from the pest-ridden coast. No doubt to any power which can undertake such a work, Africa offers a field greater than India, and one where intervention would be still more justifiable in the interests of humanity. Africa might become a gigantic Java or Ceylon.

The great question, too, whether Africa is to be Christian or Mahommedan, still hangs in the balance. The Mahommedans have very much the start of us; but the traces of old Christianity still linger in Abyssinia, and, without fully accepting Mr. Stanley's account of the extreme religious pliability of his royal friends in Central Africa, we may well believe that, with little tangible religion of their own, the mass of Pagan Africans offer a missionary field such as we have not in India. I have said that I am not at all inclined too much to disparage the Mahommedan religion, and do not doubt that it is far better than Paganism; but once Mahom-

medan never Christian. From a religious point of view we should much wish to see Africa Christian. And there is another view connected with the religious question. The civil law of the Mahommedans is sanctioned by their religion; and as members of society it is this law more than their religion which separates them from people of other faiths and religions. With the religion of the Arabs must come their code of laws—polygamy, and all the rest of it. And this makes a great social gulf between all Mahommedans and Europeans or races deriving their civilisation from European sources.

Moreover, although there was a time when the Arabs were the most energetic and civilised people in the countries on the Mediterranean, it is the fact that all the nations professing Mahommedanism are now more or less effete. Although the Khedive seems to make a fair ruler in his own country, neither financially nor politically is he strong enough to establish a great and well-organised empire in Africa such as ours in India. If he did succeed in acquiring a sort of semi-native dominion, it would be hardly consistent with a full development of European settlement and enterprise. The questions which are now so embarrassing in Egypt would be doubly so in a greater Africa.

It is then only by a first-class European power, or by a combination and agreement of first-class powers, that Africa can be fully reclaimed. Undoubtedly it is very sad if such an advance in the history of the world must be prevented by the want of accord among different powers, the unwillingness of one to allow another to undertake so humanising a work, and other embarrassments. The difficulties of the present situation are very great, and it is to be feared that they will hardly be overcome without some better understanding than now exists.

We come back, then, to the question,—Looking to Egypt as it stands and to African possibilities, is it prudent to let things drift in a direction which may cast on us an Egyptian protectorate? Should we be prepared for such a function if the will of Europe assigned it to us? I think not.

Taking the commercial view first, I cannot think that a mere question of a little higher or lower tariff on the Suez Canal could justify such a step. French and other shareholders, and all who use the Canal, are interested as well as we in keeping open the Canal. There is only question of detail—dredging and repairs, measurements and rates. It could not be worth our while to incur the responsibilities of an Egyptian dominion, and all the difficulties and jealousies which it might entail, for such an object. It would be far better to use the position which we have acquired as a basis to press for some such international arrangement as Lord Derby hints at.

In the political view, looking to our interests in Asia, my opinion is that it would not be worth while to hold Egypt in order to secure the way to India against the remote contingency of a possible temporary interruption. Egypt would be of no use for this purpose unless we at the same time held complete command of the seas on both sides of the Isthmus. If we are to maintain the Canal route in time of war, both for military and commercial purposes, we must not only have fleets superior to any fleets or combination of fleets that can be brought against them, but we must be able to keep up so complete a police of the long narrow seas between Gibraltar and Aden, that our passing ships shall be free from the risk of capture by vessels having the use of ports on the shores of those seas. It has yet to be seen whether, under the present development of steam, it would be possible to secure so long a line of navigation through so great a stretch of narrow sea. If we can really do this, then we shall be free to use the Suez Canal unless Egypt is occupied in great force by a strong military power hostile to us. It is only in the rare event of a combination of the following contingencies that it could be desirable for us to occupy Egypt.

1. War.

2. So effective a command of the seas that our ships can safely pass along the Mediterranean (I use the word in its literal sense) route.

3. The occupation of Egypt by another hostile power while we hold the seas.

We know that on the only occasion on which such circumstances have occurred—when France had occupied Egypt while we held the seas—the Great Napoleon was unable to maintain that occupation. In all probability it would be so again. It might be better to trust to our ability to secure Egypt when the necessity arises, than to forestall the necessity by undertaking an onerous charge in anticipation of a need which may not arise for generations.

After all, too, it is not a matter of life and death to us to maintain the Canal route under all possible circumstances. Suppose that, by a concurrence of events, it is some day or other (some distant day we may hope) interrupted for a time? Well, the Canal is not the only way to India. Till the other day we very well maintained our commercial and military communications by another route—to a great extent we do so still. It is only a question of a voyage longer by a month or six weeks.

If the position was reversed, if there were on the Asiatic side of the Canal some first-class power which might find an opportunity of trapping our fleet on that side, and which, holding the seas on this side for ever so short a time, might descend on our British shores, alone or with others, and strike a fatal blow at our very

heart, it might in that case be worth while to make any sacrifice to secure ourselves against the remotest possibility of such an event. But our position in India is far different. There we do not, with a petty army, depend for our existence on the command of the seas. In India we are nothing if not military. We have now great facilities of transport in India, great material and resources in the country itself. I should be very sorry indeed to suppose that we could not maintain ourselves there, even for a few months, against any force that could suddenly be sent against us, without aid from this country. When our European force was at the weakest, and our danger the greatest, we fought and won the battle of the Mutiny before effective aid from England arrived on the scene. It was not till Delhi was taken, and our eventual triumph secure, that the regiments from England came into the field to make it more rapid and complete. We should have done very well, even if troops could not then have been sent through Egypt.

If a Russian invasion be possible, it is certain that the Russian route to India is far slower than that in steamers round the Cape. No other power could send by sea, through the Suez Canal, a force which could do more than harass our coasts. It is impossible that an army, with the carriage and material necessary to cope with the means which we could bring to bear on a threatened quarter, could be sent by so long a sea voyage. I hope that we continue to establish ourselves more firmly against internal dangers. India is not worth holding if our position is not so strong that we could maintain ourselves, for a little time at any rate, against dangers external and internal without aid from England. If the delay caused by the necessity of sending the troops which we could spare from England (and how many would they be?) round the Cape on some rare occasion might be fatal, the sooner we abandon so insecure a position the better.

From an Indian point of view, then, I do not see an adequate motive for undertaking or accepting the control of Egypt. If we assume such a function, it must be because the position is in itself a desirable one.

I have said that if Egypt were not embarrassed by debt the country would pay well, and that the character and religion of the people would probably present no great obstacle to civilised control; but in fact Egypt is embarrassed by debt, with which we should find it very difficult to deal; and though it might be as easily governed as an Indian province, it would be but one Indian province the more, and that one isolated and exposed to European complications and dangers such as we do not feel in India. Although the Turks are foreigners in Egypt, the family of the Khedive has so identified itself with the country, and they are so much taking the position of

native rulers, that there would be no ground for dispossessing them any more than the best of our Indian feudatory princes. We could but assume a protectorate and suzerainty. Even the tribute which Turkey now receives as the recompense for those functions has been pledged by the Sultan to his creditors, and it would not be easy for us to get it. We should hold the position which we do towards a native State in India, which we have undertaken to protect while we do not touch the revenue. Altogether, with our enormous responsibilities for the rule or protection of 240 millions of people in India, there seems to be no call on us to undertake a few more millions in Egypt. Egypt alone is not a dominion which it would be for our advantage to undertake, or which any call of duty imposes on us.

It would only be with a view to Africa that we could think of undertaking Egypt. No doubt for the gigantic task of governing and civilising Africa we have some special facilities which no other country possesses. We have the capital, the energies, and the habitudes, by means of which we have been accustomed to occupy and improve new countries. We have learned in India the art of governing great subject populations. We have in India the materials for a native army which we might raise almost to any numbers, which, with our present experience of the northern races, we may make almost as efficient as European troops (for African purposes probably more so), and which we might employ abroad without those dangers which are inevitable to a too large and efficient native army serving in India. If we should conclude that it is right to promote emigration on a large scale from the densely populated parts of India, and should succeed in doing so, probably no field would be better than Africa, where anarchy and bloodshed have left room for much new population, and where Indian intelligence and Indian arts might do much to supplement the honest hard work of the Negro.

There is much to tempt us to such an undertaking. If the time were approaching when our work in India would be completed, when, having done our duty in that country and raised the natives to a high level, it would be better for all parties that we should leave them to govern themselves, then indeed, in view of such eventualities, it might be well that we should make a beginning of an African dominion, and look to the day when a British-African Empire might succeed our British-Indian Empire, just as in the last century the British-Indian Empire succeeded that American empire which we were compelled to abandon. But there is not yet in India any such prospect of independence and self-government. The question whither our rule in that country is tending becomes more puzzling every day; certainly we do not yet see our way to any

definite plans by which it may reach a safe self-governing position. We could not relieve ourselves of our task there even if we would, and at present, at any rate, we would not. With India on our hands, I think we could not undertake Africa. It is dangerous for a small country to undertake too much. Already we feel a strain on our population—there are other outlets to it than our own dominions and our own colonies. We could hardly undertake Africa from Indian resources alone. Capital we have in England in abundance, but a too great extension of our power might weaken the heart.

If a real working federation of English-speaking nations were possible, great things might be attempted; but at present there is no approach to any such system. The great English-speaking colonies are entirely freed from the control of the Imperial Parliament; they govern themselves as they please in all things, and only retain the right to claim our protection while it is convenient to them to do so. We can in no shape tax Canada for any Imperial object. The Australians would much like to annex New Guinea, but even that they would have us do at our expense, not theirs. Certainly we could not draw on Canada or Australia for a great African enterprise. Still better would it be if we could have a federation of European nations, or nations of European origin, and on the part of such a federation undertake the reclamation of the barbarous parts of the old world, both in Africa and in Asia; but we have not yet any immediate prospect of a union of Christian countries now armed against one another.

With our great possessions and great undertakings both of government and colonisation, we might well, without jealousy, let any other nation really capable of it, undertake a great work in Africa, if we could have sufficient guarantees for our communications and just rights; but in truth, if we cannot undertake the reclamation of Africa, still less is any other country in a position to do so. It must have become evident to France that, with her present social arrangements and the want of increment in her population, she is not a colonising country as she was in the last century. She has failed to colonise Algiers, and would, under her present circumstances, hardly seek a greater Africa. Germany has enough to do at home—Russia far more than enough. Italy is perhaps the country best fitted for an African undertaking, if her internal state were sufficiently secured and her financial position good; but that is not yet.

On the whole, I think it comes to that to which I have already pointed; viz., that the best use we can make of the interest which we have acquired in the Suez Canal, is to make it the basis for actively promoting the plan at which Lord Derby has hinted—the

control of the enterprise by some sort of international commission on the part of the powers chiefly interested. We are now in a position to promote such an arrangement, not only without creating jealousies, but by way of allaying jealousies, since it would imply the abandonment of exclusive interests and control on our part. Such an arrangement made, we could dispose of our shares to private holders, bringing them into the English market as much as possible, not in order to create a preponderating English influence, but only to render the proprietary not exclusively foreign.

There remains the real difficulty—the loan to the Khedive—the interest due from him for nineteen years to come. Whatever happens, we must always remember the maxim not to throw good money after bad; and especially we must be of all things careful not to allow a comparatively small pecuniary stake to involve us in a line of policy which we would not otherwise adopt. Unless our interest is secured by some guarantee of which we yet know nothing, our moderate 5 per cent. will be no better placed than the exorbitant return for which private financiers have stipulated. If one is not paid, neither will be the other. Mr. Cave's mission is a fact. We may hope that it will really throw some light on the Egyptian finances—a light which will probably be made available to all the world; but beyond the information thus gained once for all, we should, I think, scrupulously avoid any further *official* interference with the Khedive's financial management. We cannot so interfere without making ourselves in some sort responsible, and creating financial hopes and expectations, compared to which our own £200,000 per annum is a small sum. Of course the Khedive may avail himself of private English aid, as he may of aid from any other source. It is the official interference of the English Government which is to be eschewed. If, with such aid and advice as he can obtain, the Khedive can maintain his credit and pay his creditors, ourselves among the number, good and well; if he fails, we must submit to the loss with others, and put it down to the policy of rescuing the Suez Canal from a foreign monopoly which the Government has adopted.

There is still the old question—If the Turkish Empire breaks up, who is to take its place in regard to Egypt? I suppose there is nothing for it but to await the event. If an international control and regulation of the Canal can be established, a step will be gained, a precedent and example furnished, for some international arrangement by which Egypt may be controlled and the affairs of Central Africa regulated.

{GEORGE CAMPBELL.

WHAT ARE LIBERAL PRINCIPLES?

TWENTY years ago a strange panic seized upon the public mind in this country, and for a while shook the national faith in representative institutions. A temporary failure of our commissariat at the commencement of the Crimean war, contrasted with the supposed efficiency of French military administration, sufficed to produce a passionate impatience of parliamentary control, and a craving for "strong," if not for "personal," government. Even the Prince Consort, speaking deliberately at a critical juncture, declared that constitutional government was "under a heavy trial;" and less prudent men, with less knowledge of English history, were neither afraid nor ashamed to enlarge significantly on the merits of a dictatorship. This fit of unworthy self-abasement rapidly passed away; the vigour of English organization was seen to increase as the shortcomings of French organization became more evident with every month of the war; the French people soon afterwards began to clamour for those very liberties which Englishmen had affected to despise; Italy, Germany, and Austria herself, successively adopted constitutional government of an English type; the great struggle of 1870 showed that, for want of it, the armaments of France had no moral force behind them, and the idol of French Imperialism was finally shattered at Sedan. Thenceforward we have seldom heard of personal government, except for the purpose of pointing an adverse moral; and, in 1876, few would venture to whisper in the secret chambers those anti-constitutional sympathies which, in 1855, were freely proclaimed upon the housetops. •

A similar wave of reactionary sentiment has, nevertheless, recently passed over the surface of English politics. As the vitality of the British Constitution was impugned because the arrangements for supplying the British army had broken down in a sudden emergency, so the vitality of Liberal Principles is impugned because a Conservative Ministry has existed for two years and there is no immediate prospect of displacing it. For twenty-five years before, with three very short intervals, the Liberal Party had been in power; during this period it had triumphantly carried nearly all the measures which Liberals of the last generation had at heart; having sunk into a minority under a combination of influences that would have destroyed any other party much earlier, it has still been able to hold the ground which it had conquered; and yet there are those who profess not only to despair of its revival, but to doubt the very

existence of distinctive Liberal Principles. In vain are they reminded that patriots of former ages were content to live and content to die for principles of civil and religious liberty, which are now the inheritance of the Liberal party, but which then, as now, were a stumbling-block to faint-hearted believers and foolishness to political sceptics. In vain are they invited to watch the growing ascendancy of Liberal Principles on the Continent, after repeated discouragements, and under far more arduous conditions. They admit that in its origin the Liberal cause was the cause of the people, that it was a reality, and not a mere name, in the days of Hampden and the days of Somers, under the ill-disguised autocracy of George III. and in the great reaction which followed the French Revolution. They do not deny that momentous issues were at stake when that reaction was rudely cut short by the first Reform Act, and they are fain to acknowledge that Liberal Principles were not wholly played out when their energy was suspended during the declining years of Lord Palmerston. They cannot help perceiving that Germany has become the first Power of Europe, and that Italy has made herself a great nation, by tardily embracing the most essential of Liberal Principles; they recognise Liberal Principles as the basis of national prosperity in Switzerland, in Holland, and in Belgium; they applaud the adoption of Liberal Principles and condemn every backsliding from Liberal Principles in France; they know that Liberal Principles created the United States of America, and are the very breath of life to all the more prosperous British colonies. They would be Liberals anywhere but at home, and in any age but the present. The alleged exhaustion of Liberal Principles is peculiar, forsooth, to Great Britain, and it is from the last general election that we are complacently admonished to date the new millennium of political indifference.

But the reign of political indifference is sometimes proclaimed, not so much on the ground that Liberal Principles are exhausted, as on the ground that all their stable and valuable elements have been absorbed into modern Conservatism, or at least have become the common property of both parties. How far this is from being true will hereafter appear more clearly. In the meantime, we cannot fail to remark that, if true, it would amount to a most triumphant justification of Liberal Principles, and an almost conclusive presumption against abandoning our hold upon them. If Liberal Principles are shown to have guided the nation aright in the seventeenth century, in the eighteenth century, and during the first two-thirds of the nineteenth century; if those who persistently opposed Liberal Principles for so many generations are now convicted of having opposed reason and justice and national interest—surely this is a strange reason for abjuring Liberal Principles under their own proper title,

and fastening upon them an alien title like "Conservative" or "Constitutional," hitherto associated with resistance to Liberal Principles. If the Party which Mr. Disraeli more accurately calls "Tory" is really prepared to burn what it used to adore and adore what it used to burn, why should they cling so fondly to party watchwords and appellations which recall the shameful memories of English constitutional history, instead of borrowing the name with the glorious traditions of the Liberal Party?

But it is really difficult to discuss with a grave face the hypothesis of Liberal Principles having been recently merged in the nebulous mass of "Conservative Principles." For where, let us ask, are these Conservative Principles, and who shall either find the centre or describe the circumference of their orbit? Assuredly, Conservative Principles, if they ever existed at all, have long since been invisible to the naked eye, and the want of them is not supplied either by a community of party instincts or by the good sense and honesty of individuals. Church-and-King Toryism was at least positive, but the Conservatism now in vogue is not merely a system of negations, it is a system of negations which is constantly fluctuating with the subtraction of old and the addition of new tenets, as political expediency may require. If ever the modern Conservative Party had a fixed conviction, this conviction was that it was their mission to stem the flood of democracy; and even when Mr. Disraeli had educated them into perceiving that it would be a shrewder game to manipulate the democratic movement, and outbid their opponents, three Cabinet Ministers felt it their duty to resign, and more than one of those who retained office solemnly pledged himself never to accept household suffrage without certain definite safeguards. Within a few weeks these safeguards were thrown overboard, and these pledges broken without so much as a blush; the scruples of the weaker brethren who had seceded from the Government had become a subject of pity rather than of respect in Conservative society; and the Prime Minister, enjoying the unbounded confidence of his Party, openly boasted of having taken a leap in the dark—a leap which might imperil the British Constitution, indeed, but which could not fail to "dish the Whigs." It was no Radical enemy, but a familiar friend of the Conservative party, who, still writhing under the humiliation of 1867, described its creed as a marvellous compound of political bigotry and political infidelity. At all events, after this signal exhibition of Conservative morality, only to be matched by the conduct of the same Party on the Conspiracy Bill of 1858, it would be idle to seek anything like a Principle in the negative professions of Conservatism, while the subtlest analysis will equally fail to detect anything like a Principle in its affirmative manifestoes. The Queen's Speeches of 1874 and 1875, the

parliamentary and extra-parliamentary utterances of Conservative members, and the election addresses of candidates, may alike be ransacked without discovering a maxim by which modern Conservative statesmanship would be willing to stand or fall, unless it be the maxim of government by the landed aristocracy. *Government by the landed aristocracy* appears, in fact, to have become the one cardinal article of the Conservative faith, as it is manifestly the idea which determined the personal composition of Mr. Disraeli's Cabinet. What the landed aristocracy may do with their power, is apparently a secondary consideration in the eyes of Conservative politicians, and we have no reason to suppose that any assurances which they may now give us of hostility to household suffrage in the counties, or even of fidelity to Church and State, will be held more sacred than their repeated vows never to support a degradation of the franchise in boroughs. True, it is almost impossible to imagine the Church Establishment being deserted by the Conservative Party so long as the present system of Church patronage is upheld, but it is very easy to imagine a profound alteration in the sentiments of Conservative squires towards clergymen, if clergymen were in any sense representatives of the parishioners, or even nominees of bishops. Those who could indorse the semi-communistic programme of the New Social Alliance, or who see nothing unconstitutional in Female Suffrage, are not men to stick at political trifles, and irksome traditions of old-fashioned Toryism will be cast off as lightly as the Slave Circular was retracted, or the farmers rebuked for continuing to agitate against the malt-tax. It is, indeed, this very incapacity of seeing the difference between Principles and expedients, between wise measures and skilful manœuvres, which makes a Conservative administration so dangerous, and justifies the hopes which the promoters of revolutionary grotchets repose in its unlimited pliability.

What, then, are Liberal Principles? This is the question which Lord Derby avowed himself unable to answer in that remarkable exposition of Conservative policy at Edinburgh, which must have sounded to working men like a gospel of political despair. In approaching such an inquiry, it may not be amiss to bear in mind a striking parallel furnished by the religious world. No divisions among English Liberals are so broad, or so deep, or so ancient, or so enduring, as those which keep asunder the various Protestant churches of Europe and America. Moreover, the divisions of Protestantism are rendered more significant by contrast with the imposing unity of Catholicism—an unity which, hollow as it is, far transcends in solidity any superficial coherence of the Conservative party. Nevertheless, we may well ask whether the most sectarian of Protestants, or the most unscrupulous of Jesuits, would dispute the existence of governing ideas and definite tendencies common

to all Protestantism, and opposing an insuperable barrier to any reunion of Christendom on a Catholic basis. If this be true—and who can deny it?—there may surely be governing ideas and definite tendencies common to English Liberalism, in spite of all the differences between the centre and left wing of the Party. In other words, there may be a profound agreement on Liberal Principles underlying, in the deeper strata of thought, all the manifold disagreements on Liberal policy. To enumerate these Principles exhaustively would of course be impossible, but it is not impossible to identify some of those which are most firmly implanted in the heads and hearts of true Liberals, and the influence of which is most clearly to be traced in recent history.

II.

The first and broadest of all Liberal Principles is the unreserved recognition of Progress as the appointed law of all human institutions, civil or religious. This Principle, sometimes ridiculed as a truism by modern Conservatives, has been steadily violated or ignored in Conservative policy, and is practically embraced, with all its consequences, by Liberals alone. Looking upon the nation as a living and growing organism, a true Liberal watches, not merely without alarm but with hearty satisfaction, those results of national life and growth which call for constant readjustments of political and administrative machinery. He does not fall into the Conservative error of imagining that codes or precedents or customs or forms have any vitality or any authority in themselves, but he regards them as products of national character, the development of which should keep pace, and should not more than keep pace, with the natural process of social evolution. Acting on this Principle, the Liberal Party carried the great Reform Act of 1832, whereby the representation of petty boroughs was transferred to populous towns, and the mass of the middle classes admitted within the pale of the Constitution. Acting on this Principle, the same Party welcomed the rise of the artisan class in boroughs; and though defeated in the attempt to enfranchise the best part of them, compelled its opponents to pass a still larger extension of the suffrage, throwing out the provisions under which it was sought to take back with one hand what had been given with the other. It was this Principle which, applied to urban self-government, produced the reform of Municipal Corporations; and this which, applied to endowments, produced the Charity Commission, the University Reform Acts, and the Endowed Schools Act, with many like measures designed to protect the interests of the living against the posthumous control of the dead. It was this Principle again, which, having been adopted

too late to save the American colonies, has since been carried out by the Liberal Party in extending to most of our other colonies the privileges and obligations of free communities. But it is superfluous to multiply examples of its operation, for not a year or a month elapses without bringing up some issue on which the Liberal Party advocates progress, and the Conservative Party places itself in the attitude of obstruction. Not that every Liberal possesses, or that every Conservative lacks, the power of discerning the signs of an institution having outgrown its original structure, and the mode in which it should be adapted to new conditions. Such insight and flexibility of mind are given, in fact, to few, and fewer still retain the courage to exercise them in advanced life. But since the Liberal seers have ever been first to indicate the necessity of progressive changes, and since the Liberal Party has generally had the wisdom to follow their guidance, an active belief in Progress may justly be claimed as an essentially and distinctively Liberal Principle.

2. A second Principle, implied in the very word "Liberal," and illustrated in every chapter of Liberal policy, is an imperishable love of Freedom. Long before the Liberal Party had grasped the idea of progress, or divined the "increasing purpose" which runs through all the ages, the idea of freedom, both civil and religious, had become the very life-blood of the Liberal creed, and borne ample fruit in legislation. Animated by this Principle, as applied to colonial policy, even the oligarchical Whiggism of Burke and his associates rose into a lofty Republican strain, in protesting against the arbitrary measures which produced the American war. The freedom of the press was not achieved without a struggle prolonged from the age of Milton to a period within living memory, in which all the Conservative forces were arrayed against it, and Liberals asserted it under peril of imprisonment. Personal freedom was only secured to all British subjects by the most determined efforts of Liberals, after the Reform Act had weakened the power of the slave-owning interest and their Conservative allies. For, though Conservatives shared with Liberals the honour of abolishing the slave trade, the horrors of which shocked their humanity, very few but Liberals were found to reprobate slavery, as slavery; and it was but yesterday that Liberal opinion arrested a Conservative Government in the act of countenancing slavery by an order of the Admiralty. Freedom of worship, as well as freedom of election to municipal offices, were denied to Protestant Nonconformists, while other privileges of citizenship were denied to Roman Catholics, until both were emancipated by the irresistible pressure which the Liberal party brought to bear even on Conservative ministers. Freedom of trade was carried by means of Liberal agitation, so ably and persistently conducted as to convert another Conservative minister, who speedily

paid the price of his patriotism in expulsion from office, and who has never been forgiven by that Party which had originally imposed the Corn Laws and so long idolized the principle of Protection. Freedom of labour cannot be said to have existed in England until the restrictions imposed on the independence of labourers by the Poor Laws and Combination Laws were removed by a series of Liberal measures, culminating in the Union Chargeability Act, so bitterly opposed by the Conservatives, and the Trade Union Acts of 1871, which the present Home Secretary has extended in accordance with the proposals of Mr. Lowe. Freedom of education—in the sense of free participation in State grants and public endowments—is not even yet fully assured to all creeds in this country; but it is the Liberal Party, and the Liberal Party alone, which, step by step, has succeeded in banishing tests from elementary schools, from the universities, and from many, though not from all, of the endowed schools. Freedom of voting has always been a Liberal watchword, as the use of “legitimate influence” has been always justified by Conservatives; and, though many Liberals prized open voting even more than free voting, a majority of the Party adopted the secret ballot as the one effectual remedy against coercion and intimidation. Nor can we omit to notice the intuitive sympathy with freedom of thought which in all ages has been characteristic of political reformers. Men who have been used to let their minds play freely round the fundamental questions of politics, and men who have been used to speculate freely on the fundamental questions of religion or philosophy, cannot but feel a mutual respect and affinity. Herein lies the secret of that natural alliance between Liberalism and science, which is so mysterious to Conservatives, but which permanently enlists the most powerful intellects in the nation on the Liberal side.

It will be observed that, in all these cases, the Principle vindicated is that of individual liberty, so far, and so far only, as it is consistent with the paramount rights and duties of society. It is not Liberalism which benevolently allows each man to endanger his neighbour's health by keeping up some favourite nuisance, or to sell his neighbour adulterated goods with impunity; still less is the so-called doctrine of *laissez faire* to be reckoned among Liberal principles. From a Liberal point of view, indeed, to claim infallibility for the State is almost as absurd as to claim infallibility for the Church, and this is an additional reason for leaving both individual citizens and local communities to govern themselves as far as possible. But, after all, the State, unlike the Church, is itself in this country the highest expression of self-government, and must needs lay down rules for the mutual relations both of local communities and of individual citizens. Liberals do not hold that either local communities or

individual citizens have an abstract right to manage their own affairs, or that where the interests of others are involved with their own, they can be trusted safely to do so. Such notions are more in harmony with the French theory of Individualism and the American theory of State-right than with the historical growth of civil liberty in England, concurrently with an ever-widening supremacy of law over custom and of the nation over local government. What Liberals do hold is, simply, that in general people will manage their own affairs best, and may be trusted safely to do so where the interests of others are not involved, but that where the State finds it necessary to interfere for the common good of all, it should in general interfere by compulsory rather than by permissive legislation.

It is probably this last opinion to which Lord Derby alludes, when he speaks of a strong inclination towards "democratic despotism" as a very marked feature of "the new Radical creed." Now, it may be remarked in passing, that "democratic despotism" would at least have this advantage over monarchical or oligarchical despotism—that a majority of the people would be more likely to understand and study the real welfare of the whole than a small minority or a minority of one. Still, even "democratic despotism" is treason against political liberty, and Lord Derby's warning on this subject is not altogether unseasonable. No doubt a disposition has lately manifested itself to rebel against the sound but unsentimental rules of political economy, and to seek for social improvement by the shorter method of State intervention. The usual excuse for such intervention is that long arrears of legislation must needs be made up without delay, and that it is but equity for Government to redress in one age evils which Government may have fostered in another age. The distinction between acts which affect the individual only and those which affect his fellows also is forgotten or ignored. Because compulsory vaccination may be justified as a necessary safeguard of public health, and compulsory education as a means of rescuing neglected children from vice and crime, it is assumed that some good and no harm can result from a compulsory regulation of agricultural contracts or of ship-building. Protectionist fallacies of this kind may or may not form part of some "new Radical creed" known to Lord Derby, as they assuredly form part of the delusive visions held out by less scrupulous Conservatives than Lord Derby to credulous working men. But they are flagrantly at variance with Liberal Principles, and have been steadily discouraged, at no light sacrifice of popularity, by the responsible leaders of the Liberal Party.

3. Next among the distinctive Principles of Liberalism must be placed the pregnant, but thoroughly constitutional, idea of Equality

—not of social but of civil equality—of that equality before the law to which all the subjects of a British Sovereign have as good a right as all the citizens of a Greek Republic. Liberals know as well as Conservatives that men are not born equal in ability, in virtue, or in the prospects of fortune which depend on parentage. What they fail to understand is, why these startling contrasts between the original lot of Dives and of Lazarus should be aggravated, rather than mitigated, by the effect of human laws. They are fully aware that, in a country like our own, where feudal traditions are still potent, and where the ambition of founding a family is the besetting weakness of every *parvenu*, the custom of primogeniture, unless directly forbidden by law, is likely to prevail for many generations. But they do not see either the justice or the expediency of consecrating this custom by legislative enactment—of prescribing, in the case of descent on intestacy, and of favouring, in the case of family settlements, the practice of accumulating all landed property upon the eldest son. They acknowledge that in filling the higher posts of the civil, naval, and military service, a large discretion must be left to patronage, and therefore a wide door opened to nepotism and jobbery; they perceive, also, that no precaution can deprive rich men's sons of the lion's share in the distribution of clerkships by literary competition. But these considerations do not lead them to regard a reckless distribution of great offices with any satisfaction, or to neglect the only measures through which promotion by merit can be effectually substituted for the caste system in the army, navy, and civil departments. On the contrary, the Liberal Party, with the aid of one or two enlightened Conservatives, has at length succeeded in establishing competitive examinations as the one avenue to inferior posts in the Civil Service; while the same Party, opposed by the whole Conservative force, carried the abolition of purchase in the army, and vainly strove to defeat the reactionary designs embodied in the Army Exchange Bill and the new regulations for the appointment of naval cadets. Liberals, again, are perfectly conscious that, however complete may be the legal equality of electors, the practical influence of education, of property, and of mere notoriety will make one voter's support worth a hundred or a thousand times as much as that of another. But this does not prevent their regarding all their fellow-citizens as "their own flesh and blood," or reconcile them to a carefully packed representation of "interests," or cause them to favour schemes for enabling the few to outvote the many. They appreciate the prodigious advantage which the Church of England possesses by virtue of its history, its corporate revenues, the perfection of its organization, and the learning of its clergy, over and above that which it derives from its connection with the State. But this did not seem to

them a good reason for extending to Church affairs the maxim, "To him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken away;" they protested loudly against the exaction of Church-rates from Nonconformists, as well as against the exclusion of Nonconformists from educational endowments, and they now protest against the prohibition of Nonconformist services in parochial churchyards.

These are a few typical specimens of the mode in which the Liberal Principle of civil Equality has been applied by the Liberal Party, not in levelling down, but in levelling up, not in weakening the strong, but in strengthening the weak, not in destroying the power of natural superiority, but in breaking down the artificial barriers raised between man and man by Privilege, Monopoly, and Ascendancy. If this be Democracy, then Liberal Principles are democratic, and it is for those who repudiate Democracy, in this sense, to uphold that of which it is the opposite.

4. Closely allied to a belief in civil Liberty and a belief in civil Equality, is a fourth Liberal Principle which is difficult to describe in a single word or phrase, but which is deeply rooted in every Liberal mind. This principle is an immutable respect for human nature as such, not merely because Christianity invests every human being with the majesty of immortality, but also because experience has shown that every race and every type of mankind is endowed with noble qualities and capable of almost infinite elevation. It was this respect for human nature and human destiny which leagued itself with the idea of liberty to crush slavery. It was this which annulled the Draconian code, assigning death as the penalty of two hundred and thirty-eight offences; teaching men that even criminals have claims on society, and that if repression is the primary, reformation is the secondary object of punishment. It is this which inspires Liberals with a manly aversion to the punishment of the lash, the use of the branding-iron, and the infliction of any needless personal indignity even on the outcasts of society. It is this which has enlisted so many Liberals on the side of Labour in its struggle for independence, and which is ever on the watch against the judicial oppression which is still occasionally practised at petty sessions. It is this which has gradually introduced humanity into our relations with savage tribes, and forbearance into our relations with subject populations, which has saved the Maories of New Zealand from extermination, and which sternly condemned the atrocities perpetrated under the rule of martial law in Jamaica.

The love of Peace, which has so nobly characterized the Liberal party since the age of Fox, sometimes curbing the aggressive impulses of British commerce in Asia, and often restraining us from disastrous intervention in Europe or America, has its main origin in a

cognate Principle. If Liberals alone refuse to regard war as a permanent institution, and are ever seeking to diminish its causes, it is not because they prefer material prosperity to national greatness; it is because they have a worthy conception of national greatness, because their feelings towards foreign peoples are feelings of friendship rather than of enmity, and, above all, because they can sympathize with the suffering and toiling masses who have everything to lose and nothing to gain by military glory. From a like source there springs that generous confidence in popular intelligence and sense of right which convinced Liberals that, in spite of Conservative maledictions, the Republican bubble had not burst in America, and that no United States Government supported by the American people would ever be guilty of repudiation; which has always actuated Liberals in dealing with the parliamentary and municipal franchise, and which fortified Liberals against the Conservative fear of a cheap newspaper press. And as Liberals believe in public virtue and national conscience and international morality, so they believe in the honest and independent exercise of human reason. Upon this belief reposes the sturdy Protestantism of which Liberalism is the political counterpart, which thinks nobly of the human soul, and which holds, in opposition to Romanism, that on the open field of inquiry truth, and not error, must in the end prevail. This is why Liberals are plausibly accused of optimism, and occasionally lend too ready an ear to schemes of world-bettering. Looking upon what men have done as "the earnest of what they yet may do," knowing that by the efforts of human intellect civilisation has been evolved from barbarism, sanguine Liberals may be tempted, indeed, to expect too much from similar efforts organized under scientific guidance, but their hopefulness is in itself a motive power of untold value, and their enthusiasm wiser than all the cynical sagacity of Conservative pessimism.

5. It may well appear somewhat pharisaical to class an habitual regard for political justice among distinctive Liberal Principles, and it would indeed be absurd if the Liberal party should arrogate to itself the sole possession of this sentiment. Nevertheless, facts go far to prove that Justice is a governing idea of Liberal policy in a sense which is not merely foreign to Conservative policy, but which Conservative politicians have often laughed to scorn. All the Reform Bills supported by the Liberal party, including two Irish bills introduced by Mr. Butt last session, have been advocated mainly on grounds of political justice, and opposed by the Conservative Party on grounds of naked expediency. The Irish Church Act was essentially based on considerations of justice and not of selfish utility, for it was foreseen that it would fail to conciliate Irish Catholics and would provoke bitter resentment among Irish Pro-

testants. The Washington Treaty, with the expression of national regret which it embodied for the first time in diplomatic history, was entirely dictated by the sentiment of justice. Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet was not weak enough to suppose that so high-spirited a people as the British people would relish a virtual acknowledgment of having been in the wrong; but they were convinced that in the single case of the *Alabama* we had been in the wrong, and they had the manliness to make the *amende honorable* on behalf of their countrymen. It would be easy to cite other unpopular acts of Liberal Governments, for which no other motive than a sentiment of justice can be imagined, and into which no Conservative tactician like Mr. Disraeli would ever have been thus betrayed. On the other hand, it would not be difficult to cite unjust acts of Conservative Governments—such as the suppression of the Heligoland Constitution—for which no particular motive can be imagined, but of which no Liberal minister could have been guilty. But perhaps the most suggestive example of the difference between the Conservative and the Liberal standard of political justice is to be found in the much greater fairness of Liberal warfare in opposition. It has been said that Mr. Gladstone's Administration was “lied out of office;” and though such a statement may be too unqualified, it is certain that no resource of factious intrigue or calumnious mendacity was left untried by the Conservative Party. Instead of retaliating, the ex-ministers in the House of Commons, under Lord Hartington's leadership, have frequently befriended Mr. Disraeli's Government in their parliamentary difficulties, have commented with great moderation on their official blunders, and have sometimes carried forbearance to excess where abuses of patronage ought to have been exposed. After duly considering this, let any impartial man compare the present courteous tone of the Liberal press with the unscrupulous language employed by the Conservative press during the last Parliament, and he will be driven to conclude that fair play in political controversy is a distinctive Liberal Principle.

6. One more Liberal Principle remains to be mentioned, which of late years has become the most distinctive of all—the deliberate preference of national interests over all minor interests, whether of classes, of sects, of professions, or of individuals. At first sight this Principle, like the last, so closely resembles an elementary precept of public morality, that we may hesitate to treat it as characteristic of one Party rather than another. Unhappily, experience has shown that no Principle is more at variance with the spirit of Conservative policy, as there is none which promises less ephemeral popularity to any Party which honestly observes it. In old times, a corrupt expenditure of a few thousand pounds would buy the support of a powerful family or a parliamentary seat of priceless value to a

ministry, without appreciably injuring the pocket or the feelings of a single voter, and not the smallest particle of national gratitude was to be earned by abstaining from it. So, in these days, it is far more profitable to propitiate a class at the expense of the nation, than it is to serve the nation at the expense of a class. The apostles of Free Trade were fortunate enough to array the interests of one class against those of another, and for once to persuade the people that all of them would gain, as consumers, by cheapening imports, while only a section of them were guining, as producers, by Protection. It is seldom, however, that a political lesson can be so closely brought home, and the fate of the last Ministry suffices to show at what a cost the Liberal Principle of subordinating particular to national interests must generally be maintained. In dealing with the Irish Church and the Irish land, in reforming the licensing system, in abolishing army purchase, in regulating educational endowments, in remodelling the judicature, in reducing their own patronage, in enforcing economy in all branches of the public service, and still more in the general tenor of their whole administrative policy, Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues were guilty of sheer Quixotry in the eyes of Conservatives; for they had actually offended or alarmed the clergy of the Established Church, the landlords, the brewers and publicans, the officers of the army, the local trustees of schools, the lawyers, the clerks in public offices, and the waiters upon Providence, without benefiting any one—except the nation. We have since had an excellent illustration of policy based on the opposite Principle. By relieving English publicans from some of the restrictions on disorder and drunkenness, by talking out the Irish Sunday Closing Bill, by legalizing bargains for regimental exchanges, by restoring the nomination system for naval cadetships, by revising the Adulteration Act, by mutilating the Judicature Act, and by suppressing the Endowed Schools Commission as an independent body, Mr. Disraeli and his colleagues have appeased more or less fully most of the classes “harassed” by their predecessors; and all this, too, without injuring any one—except the nation.

The preference of popular to proprietary rights, where they come into collision, is but a corollary of the same Principle. In the eyes of a Liberal, it is more important that Birmingham should be drained than it is that neighbouring landowners should escape any annoyance; towns and villages below twenty-five thousand inhabitants ought not to be excluded from the Artizans’ Dwellings Bill to please the country gentlemen; nor should the Agricultural Children’s Act be made a dead letter to save the pockets of farmers. Cattle-owners ought not to be compensated twice over for losses by the Rinderpest at the expense of consumers; poor commoners have quite as sacred privileges as lords of manors; and the revenues of the London com-

panies are not to be left at the private disposition of their members present and future. It was not Liberal members of Parliament that cheered the insolent self-laudation of a shipowner who had compromised the neutrality of England for the sake of commercial profit. It was not a Liberal Government that contrived to undo the beneficent legislation of 1844, and relieve the owners of noxious manufactories in London from the statutable obligation to remove them in the year 1874; nor was it a Liberal Government that showed the cloven foot of favouritism on the question of savings-bank accounts. Nay, more—it was once a Liberal paradox that property has its duties as well as its rights; and it is still a Liberal paradox that proprietary rights, like all other rights, were created by law for the benefit, not of individuals, but of the entire community.

But this distinction between Liberal and Conservative ideas is more clearly marked in everyday administration than it is in legislation, and in those details of administration which are not seen than it is in those which are seen. It sometimes appears as if Conservatives lacked the very belief in the efficacy of administrative public spirit. When a Conservative Government comes into office, there is not a public servant, civil or military—from the admiral or general to the humblest sailor or private, and from the heads of departments to the lowest clerk or messenger—who does not receive the impression that strict vigilance is no longer the order of the day, that national requirements are no longer to domineer over private claims, that England no longer expects every man to do his duty, but only hopes that he will do so. The effect of this impression is not felt at once. For a while it appears that it is possible for a Government to scatter and yet to increase, to serve its friends and the nation with equal fidelity, to reap efficiency without sowing purity and economy. But a time surely comes when the Estimates are mysteriously swelled, no one can say how, and there is less than ever to show for the outlay; when the fruits of Liberal policy have been consumed; when one class after another manifests signs of disappointment; and when the nation, roused from its indolent good-nature, realises that a paramount regard for national interests is, after all, the only Principle on which national interests can be permanently secured.

III.

Those who recognise the Principles here laid down as distinctively Liberal, will hardly dispute that, in their nature, they are capable of infinite new applications. But it may reasonably be asked why Liberal Policy is now in abeyance if these principles be living principles, and whether they are of any practical value in their bearing on the politics, not of the remote future, but of the present? The first of these questions admits of a simple answer. Liberal Policy

is now, and may continue awhile to be, in abeyance, owing to a concurrence of causes which imply no weakness in Liberal Principles. In the first place, no Party in opposition is bound to formulate a schedule of the measures which it would endeavour to carry, if it should regain power at some indefinite period. The late Sir Robert Peel said that he was not in the habit of prescribing before he was called in, and Mr. Disraeli once intimated, with more amusing frankness, that it would be absurd to expect a declaration of policy until he should get access to the pigeon-holes of the public offices. Even if the Liberal Party had now a leader with as full an authority as Mr. Disraeli then possessed, he would show little prudence by disclosing gratuitously, to friends and enemies alike, the plan of his next campaign. But it is no secret that, at present, the future leader of the Liberal Party is not yet designated, and Lord Hartington, who has magnanimously consented to fill a peculiarly difficult position, is more than justified in studious reticence. Mr. Gladstone may well shrink from undertaking to resume the leadership whenever the party may next be in office, and may well hold that whoever is destined to lead the party in office should learn to lead it in opposition. Still, while Mr. Gladstone, with unabated powers, remains a possible leader, it is hardly possible for any one else to act effectively in that capacity. Nor is this all: however clearly the objects of a prospective Liberal Policy may be defined in the minds of those who must hereafter be called upon to shape it, unforeseen circumstances must determine which of such objects should be put in the foreground and which left in the background when the proper occasion arises. One of these circumstances is the state of that popular sentiment miscalled public opinion. A nation, like an individual, has its nobler and its duller moods; and so long as the people at large manifest no aspiration towards a higher political or social condition, there is no room for a Liberal Policy worthy of the name.

It is not, however, to be disguised that real and practical differences of opinion divide the various sections of the Liberal Party from each other. There are those who hold the separation of Church from State to be the first and most urgent duty of Liberal statesmanship, and there are those who advocate the extension of household suffrage to counties as the keystone of future Liberal Policy, while there are those who deprecate both these measures as either mischievous or premature. There are those who advise the Liberal Party to stake itself upon effecting organic changes in the Constitution, such as the abolition or sweeping reform of the House of Lords, while there are those who think it safer to keep great noblemen in the House of Lords than to risk having them in the House of Commons, and who prefer an unreformed House of Lords because

it is less capable of resisting the popular will. There are those whose test of Liberal orthodoxy is the adhesion to schemes which they cherish as vitally affecting the moral or social good of the community, but which they know to be condemned by other members of the Liberal party; while there are those who consider it better generalship to select as rallying points, not those positions which a few Liberals may be eager to defend with their lives, but those positions around which the whole Liberal army can be marshalled in battle-array.

Such differences, so long as they prevail, are doubtless fatal to party discipline; but must they of necessity prevail for ever, and shall the harmonious unity of Liberal principles result in no possible unity of Liberal action? To answer this, we must touch, however briefly, on certain open questions of Liberal Policy; and since it would be of no avail to discuss those of lesser difficulty, let us grapple at once with those which divide the Party most, not for the purpose of pretending to solve them, but for the purpose of ascertaining whether they are really incapable of solution by the light of Liberal Principles.

1. To begin, then, with the County Franchise—what do Liberals and Conservatives respectively think of its extension to all ratepaying householders? The Conservative is naturally averse to it, hating every approach to manhood suffrage, viewing the political emancipation of agricultural labourers with unfeigned distrust, and fearing lest they should combine with Radical artizans, under the influence of agitators, against landlords and farmers. At the same time, if Mr. Disraeli were quite sure that it would succeed as a party manœuvre, he might prepare himself for another leap in the dark, hoping that, on the whole, the votes of the more enlightened labourers would be neutralized by those of the illiterate residuum. The Liberal instinctively looks at the question from a precisely opposite point of view. Without laying any stress on abstract rights, he regards it as a source of national strength that as many citizens as possible should take part in politics, and feels ashamed that almost the whole class of husbandmen should have been disfranchised, on the plea of incompetence, for three centuries after the Reformation. He may or he may not agree with Mr. Trevelyan in considering them as having now attained their political majority; but if not, he is only the more eager to promote their political education, welcomes gladly every sign of growing independence, and only dreads lest the more intelligent labourers should be swamped, as the Conservative hopes, by those who vote at the bidding of employers, publicans, or ministers of religion. In short, the differences among Liberals on this subject are mere differences of judgment about the proper time of doing what all desire to see done. Every year inevitably lessens the degree of such differences, and it

is morally certain that, before many sessions have passed, the Liberal Party will be united, either in extending the county franchise, or in converting into a reality some illusory extension of it to be proposed by the Conservative Party.

2. Take, again, two groups of questions more intimately connected with each other than is generally realised—the questions which relate to Land and Local Government respectively. What Liberal defends the present Law of Primogeniture or power of strict entail, the cumbrous formalities which favour the aggregation of landed property and prevent its dispersion, the inadequate security against encroachments on common rights, the feudal spirit or the magisterial administration of the Game Laws? On every one of these points, it is true, diverse opinions might be culled from Liberal speeches and writings, as diverse criticisms were offered by Liberals on the Agricultural Holdings Bill. But does any one doubt that if a well-matured remedy for all or any one of these anomalies, so dear to Conservatives, were brought forward by a responsible Liberal Government, it would command the loyal support of the Liberal Party? In the same way, Liberal borough members cannot be expected to adopt precisely the same view as Liberal county members of Local Government and Taxation. No political connection will obliterate the natural distinction between urban and rural interests, but then no rational Ministry, chosen from the Liberal party, would ignore that natural distinction, while the revival of self-government in country districts, and the concentration of municipal authorities in towns, would command a cordial assent from all sections of the Party. A Whig nobleman is, of course, better satisfied than a Radical alderman with the present stratification of society and distribution of powers in counties; but the Whig nobleman, like the Radical alderman, believes in progress, in liberty, in civil equality, in the prevailing virtue and good sense of his countrymen, in political justice, and in the supremacy of national over private ends. For him, therefore, a reform of county-government in a democratic sense has no terrors, especially if accompanied by such changes as may attract into the service of local government, both in counties and in municipalities, the rightful aristocracy, not of birth or of wealth, but of education. There is some reason to believe that, if Mr. Gladstone's Administration had remained in office, a popular and comprehensive settlement of these questions relating to Land and Local Government would have been its next great enterprise. As there is very little danger of such settlement being effected by Conservatives, it remains for Liberals to consider whether these questions, perilous as they may seem, are not really among those upon which there is most practical convergence of Liberal opinion.

3. But even supposing that Liberal Principles afford a solution of the County Franchise question, the various Land questions, and the

questions which concern Local Government, what are we to say of the Education question? Let us say, boldly, what is the simple truth, that on no other political question is the essential agreement between Liberals so profound, as on no other have their superficial differences been so grossly magnified by themselves as well as by their opponents. All Liberals concur in regarding primary education as the imperative duty not only of parents but of the State. All would prefer a municipal to a voluntary or denominational system of school government; all would object to giving one child, by reason of its parents' creed, any advantage over another in respect of secular teaching, and nearly all would object to excluding religious teaching from schools aided by public funds. Every one of these conclusions is a simple deduction from the Liberal principles of liberty, civil equality, and confidence in the people; every one, except the last, has been stoutly controverted by Conservatives. Then what is the extent of the differences which are paraded as if they were irreconcilable? That some Liberals were for giving more favourable, and some for giving less favourable, terms to existing schools on the voluntary system, which it was evident must sooner or later give way to schools on the municipal, or School Board, system. That Mr. Forster often spoke, and sometimes acted, as if his object were to "supplement" the voluntary system, whereas the object of many Liberals was more or less gradually to supersede that system—which has actually been, and could not fail to be, the effect of his measure. That some Liberals desired to make education universally compulsory from the first, while others thought it wiser to proceed by steps, and to cover the country with good schools before compelling all children to go into them. Surely, we must needs confess, that Liberal Principles have little to do with common sense if differences so trifling and so transitory could produce a perpetual rupture in the Liberal Party. The fact is that, at the present moment, this rupture is at an end for all purposes of political action, and that nothing stands in the way of a combined movement for the complete organization of education, primary, secondary, and academical, on a truly Liberal basis. For Liberals value national education as the most powerful corrective of social irregularities and theological prejudices; they protest, as one man, against stereotyping the isolation of classes and sects in schools and universities; and they will never cease to resist the bigotry which treats dogmatic antipathies as if they were grounded in religion and morality.

4. In this spirit they will unanimously reconsider the far more formidable question of the relation between Church and State, whenever it shall become necessary to deal with it by legislation. Here, if anywhere, the Liberal party is supposed to be rent asunder by a schism which cannot be healed. Here, therefore, if anywhere, the cohesive power of Liberal principles may be tested, and for this

purpose we shall find it instructive to examine the position of a Liberal who thinks it expedient to maintain the Church of England, not for the sake of its doctrinal teaching or Episcopal constitution, but for the sake of religious liberty and of national interest. Such a Liberal will heartily recognise the merits of self-government, ecclesiastical as well as civil, and may well envy Presbyterians that habit of popular control over Church affairs which is the strongest and healthiest root of Scotch Liberalism. He will freely admit that acting gregariously, in Convocation or elsewhere, the clergy of the Church have generally been on the side of reaction, and sometimes of oppression. He will admit further that a zealous and influential section of the clergy is bent on divesting the Church of its Protestant character, and making it an instrument of the Romish Propaganda. These considerations, however, instead of inclining him to Disestablishment, convince him that Disestablishment would be fraught with national danger. He knows that, by virtue of its connection with the State, the Church of England is penetrated with lay ideas beyond any other communion in Christendom, and that a severance of this connection is the darling object of those who desire to convert its clergy from ministers of the people into a true sacerdotal order. He does not forget that, whereas Convocation is impotent to alter the doctrine or discipline of the Church in the minutest particular, the national Legislature is omnipotent to modify both as it may see fit. He foresees that what is called Disestablishment would practically mean the establishment by law of a vast and irresponsible corporation, separated from the nation for the first time in English history, but endowed with so enormous a share of national property that it would become a menacing power in the State, holding a fortress in every parish, and commanding all the grandest ecclesiastical buildings in England. This corporation, he cannot but fear, would be clerical and episcopal in a sense of which England has yet had no experience, for the secular ministrations now undertaken by clergymen as servants of the State would then be merged in public worship and religious instruction, while in any future Synod a preponderance would certainly be secured to clerical votes over lay votes, and to the votes of bishops over those of the inferior clergy. The example of Scotland and America does not encourage him to hope that a Church so constituted would be less exclusive socially or less aristocratic in its spirit than the present Church of England—that it would contain a larger or nearly so large a proportion of philosophical thought and enlightened charity. The example of Holland and Belgium teaches him that Ultramontanism is strong where Erastianism is weak, and observations made nearer home warn him to beware lest, in clutching at a phantom of religious equality, he should let go the substance of religious liberty. For these and like reasons, each of which constitutes a good Ritualistic argument in

favour of Disestablishment, he looks upon the Radical demand for Disestablishment as no legitimate expression of Liberal Principles. He can easily understand why the High Church Party should treat Comprehension as an exploded chimera, should deprecate all Parliamentary interference with Church-government, and should be willing to invest a sectarian fragment of the nation with that power over the ancient Church of England which the whole nation actually possesses and ought to exercise. What surprises him is that such an alternative should commend itself to any Liberal, and he would fain suggest for the consideration of the Liberal Party three very simple queries, which often recur to his own mind:—Whether the wisest Churchmen are not prepared to popularise and reform the Church system to any extent that may be necessary in order to harmonize it with the political development of the nation and the spiritual wants of each local community?—Whether the wisest Nonconformists are not prepared to accept such an ecclesiastical settlement as would bring Church affairs, with the disposition of national Church property, within the sphere and under the effective control of local government?—Whether the gulf between these lines of Church-reform is so impassable that no statesmanship, though inspired by Liberal Principles, can ever bridge it over?

It thus appears that on the most important issues of current politics, and even on the most intractable of all, the unity of Liberal Principles is not only distinctive enough to repel amalgamation with Conservatism, but definite enough to indicate a basis of united Liberal action. Nothing but degeneracy in the Liberal Party can long arrest the revival of such action, for the necessity for it is as urgent as ever. As we survey the world around us, we cannot flatter ourselves that Liberalism "has attained the *euthanasia* of political theories, and passed from the agitation of controversy into the dignified repose of tacit recognition." While the air is thick with projects of social improvement, and Conservatives are troubled with visions of a coming Democracy, the prospect of Liberal Principles becoming obsolete seems almost as remote as that of gravitation being superseded by some higher law of nature. Doubtless it is possible to imagine a new order of things in which these Principles shall perish, as it were, of inanition, when there shall be no further advance to be made, no liberties to be vindicated, no inequalities to be removed, no rights of humanity to be upheld, no wrongs to be redressed, and no private interests to be overruled for the public weal. Enough for us that such a consummation is neither within our grasp nor within our view, that fresh heights are ever rising before us on the horizon, and that, now as ever, Liberal Principles are the only Principles by which the great movement of national life can be safely guided towards its unknown destination.

GEORGE C. BRODRICK.

DUTCH GUIANA.¹

CHAPTER III.

THE RIVER.

"The river nobly foams and flows,
The charm of this enchanted ground,
And all its thousand turns disclose
Some fresher beauty varying round."

BYRON.

WITH a subdued silvery gleam, the surest promise in these latitudes of a clear day to follow, the sun peeped through the network of the forest that here does duty for horizon on every side, when our party mustered under the neat wooden pavilion of the landing place between the parade ground and the river, I might have not less correctly said the highway. For the true highways of this land are its rivers, traced right and left with matchless profusion by nature herself, and more commodious could scarce be found anywhere. Broad and deep, tidal, too, for miles up their course, but with scarcely any variation in the fulness of their mighty flow summer or winter, rainy season or dry, so constant is the water-supply from its common origin, the Equatorial mountain-chain, they give easy access to the innermost recesses of the vast regions beyond, east, west, and south; and where their tortuous windings and multiplied side canals fail to reach, Batavian industry and skill have made good the want by canals, straighter in course, and often hardly inferior in navigable capacity to the mother rivers themselves. On the skeleton plan, so to speak of this mighty system of water communication, the entire cultivation of the inland has been naturally adjusted; and the estates of Surinam are ranged one after another along the margins of rivers and canals, just as farms might be along highways and byways in Germany or Hungary. Subservient to the water ways, narrow land paths follow the river or trench by which not every estate alone, but its every subdivision of an estate, every acre almost is defined and bordered, while the smaller dykes and canals are again crossed by wooden bridges, maintained in careful repair, but paths and bridges alike are of a width and solidity adapted to footmen only, or at best horsemen; the proper carriage road is the river or canal.

In a climate like that of Surinam, bodily exertion is a thing to be economized as much as possible; and accordingly everybody keeps his carriage, I mean his boat. That of the wealthy estate owner, of the vicarious "attorney" (not a professional one, I may as

(1) Continued from *Fortnightly Review* for December, 1875.

well remark for the benefit of those unused to West-Indian nomenclatures, but the holder of a power of attorney, on the proprietor's behalf), of the merchant, of the higher official, and generally of every one belonging to this or the other of what are conveniently called the "upper classes," is a comfortable barge, painted white for coolness sake, and propelled by oars varying in number from four to eight.

A fresh painted, well-kept eight-oar, with a cabin of the kind just described, but of the very largest dimensions, the sides, ceiling, hangings, cushions, all white, with a dash of gilding here and there; eight rowers dressed in loose white suits, with broad red sashes round their waists, and on their heads blue caps to complete the triple colours of the national flag, make a pretty show on the sunlit river; and the Governor's barge might, for picturesque appearance, match the Caique of a Stamboul dignitary, besides being as much superior to the eastern conveyance in comfort, as inferior in speed. The white painted six-oar, four-oar, or even two-oar barges too, that abound for ordinary voyaging, though of course smaller in their dimensions and less gay in their accessories, are pleasant objects to look at, and may bring to mind the gondolas of Venetian waters; with this difference, that whereas the Adriatic crews are white, or what should be white, and the boats black, here the colours are, and not disadvantageously for pictorial effect, exactly reversed.

So much for the "genteeler sort." Larger yet and more solidly built, are the great lighter-like barges, whether open or partly covered, that convey down stream from the river-side estates casks of sugar or molasses, barrels of rum, sacks of cocoa, heaped-up yams, plantains, sweet potatoes, cocoa-nuts, cassava, and the hundred other well-known but too little cultivated products of this teeming land. Alongside of these may be often seen the floating cottages of the so-called "bush negroes," well thatched and snug; each occupying half or more of a wide flat-bottomed boat, where two stalwart blacks in genuine African garb, that is, next to no garb (*vid.* the woodcuts in Winwood Reade's amusing narratives, *passim*), paddle rather than row; and any number of black ladies, hardly more encumbered by their costumes than their lords, with an appropriate complement of ebony children, these last in no costume at all, look out from the cabin doors. In their wake follows a raft of cut timber, green-heart probably, or brown-heart, or purple-heart, or balata, or letter-wood, or locust-wood, or whatever other forest-growth finds its market in town; and standing on it, one or more statuesque figures, that look as if they had been cut out of dark porphyry by no unskilful hand, and well polished afterwards, guide its downward course. Most numerous of all, light corials, that have retained the Indian name as well as build, each one hollowed out of a single tree-trunk, with sometimes a couple of extra planks roughly tacked on to the sides

by way of bulwarks, paddle past us, under the guidance of one or two ragged negro labourers, or husbandmen, who exchange shouts, sometimes of jest, sometimes of quarrel, with their fellows in other boats or on the shore. These little skiffs, drawing scarce a foot of water when deepest laden, pass through the narrowest ditches that divide almost every acre of cultivated land on the estates from the other, and are the chief means of passage for the working folks on their way to and fro between country and town. When not in actual use they are kept sunk in water just deep enough to cover them, and thus preserved from the sun-heat, which would otherwise soon split the unseasoned wood. Lastly, a few clumsy boats of the ordinary longshore type, in the service of trade with the ships that lie anchored, giving out or taking in cargo off the town-wharf, mix up with the rest, and add their quota of variety to the river crafts of Surinam.

However, on the present occasion it is neither barge, plain or gay, nor a boat, not even a corial, that is waiting to receive our party. A flat-bottomed river steamer, one of the three that belong to the service of the colony, lies off the wharf; she draws about ten feet of water, and her duty is just now to convey us up the Commeweyne River, and its main tributary the Cottica, where lies the district which His Excellency has selected for our inspection, because affording the greatest variety of scenery and cultivation within easy reach of Paramaribo. I have said that the colony possesses three of these boats; the largest of them makes a voyage along the sea-coast as far as Georgetown twice every month; the two smaller confine their excursions within the limits of river navigation.

In a few minutes we were all on board, a merry party, Dutch and English, official and non-official, military, naval, civilian and burgher, but all of us bent alike on pleasing and being pleased to the best of our opportunities. Our boat was well supplied, too, with whatever Dutch hospitality—no unsubstantial virtue—could furnish for convivial need, and was commanded by a paragon of boat-captains—a bright-eyed, brown-faced little man, Scotch by his father's side, Indian by his mother's; himself uniting in physiognomy as in character the shrewdness and practical good sense of the former parentage with the imperturbable calm and habitual good-humour of the latter. Under such auspices we started on our way.

To enter the Commeweyne River we were first obliged to retrace a portion of the route by which I had arrived three days before, and to follow the downward course of the Surinam River for about eight miles, passing the same objects, no longer wholly new, but now more interesting than before, because nearer and better understood. Here is a plantation, seen by glimpses through the mangrove scrub that borders the river's bank; a narrow creek, at the mouth of which

several moored barges and half-submerged corials are gathered, gives admittance to the heart of the estate. It is a vast cocoa-grove, where you may wander at will under three hundred and fifty continuous acres of green canopy—that is, if you are ready to jump over any number of small brimming ditches, and to cross the wider irrigation trenches on bridges, the best of which is simply a round and slippery tree-trunk, excellently adapted, no doubt, to the naked foot of a negro labourer, but on which no European boot or shoe can hope to maintain an instant's hold. Huge pods, some yellow, some red—the former colour is, I am told, indicative of better quality—dangle in your face, and dispel the illusion by which you might at first sight of the growth and foliage around you have fancied yourself to be in the midst of a remarkably fine alder-tree thicket; while from distance to distance broad-boughed trees of the kind called by the negroes “coffee-mamma,” from the shelter they afford to the plantations of that bush, spread their thick shade high aloft, and protect the cocoa bushes and their fruit from the direct action of the burning sun. Moisture, warmth, and shade—these are the primary and most essential conditions for the well-doing of a cocoa estate. Innumerable trenches, dug with mathematical exactitude of alternate line and interspace, supply the first requisite; a temperature that, in a wind-fenced situation like this, bears a close resemblance for humid warmth to that of an accurately shut hothouse, assures the second; and the “coffee-mamma,” a dense-leaved tree, not unlike our own beech, guarantees the third. Thus favoured, a Surinam cocoa crop is pretty sure to be an abundant one. Ever and anon, where the green labyrinth is at its thickest, you come suddenly across a burly Creole negro, busily engaged in plucking the large pods from the boughs with his left hand, and holding in it so, while with a sharp cutlass held in his right he dexterously cuts off the upper part of the thick outer covering, then shakes the slimy agglomeration of seed and white burr clinging to it into a basket set close by him on the ground. A single labourer will in this fashion collect nearly four hundred pounds' weight of seeds in the course of a day. When full the baskets are carried off on the heads of the assistant field-women, or, if taken from the remoter parts of the plantation, are floated down in boats or corials to the brick-paved courtyard adjoining the planter's dwelling-house, where the nuts are cleansed and dried by simple and inexpensive processes, not unlike those in use for the coffee-berry; after which nothing remains but to fill the sacks, and send them off to their market across the seas.

A Guiana cocoa-plantation is an excellent investment. The first outlay is not heavy, nor is the maintenance of the plantation expensive—the number of labourers bearing an average proportion of one to nine to that of the acres under cultivation. The work required

is of a kind that negroes, who are even now not unfrequently prejudiced by the memory of slave days against the cane-field and sugar-factory, undertake willingly enough; and to judge by their stout limbs and evident good condition, they find it not unsuited to their capabilities. More than four million pounds' weight of cocoa are yearly produced in Surinam, "which is a consideration," as a negro remarked to me, laboriously attempting to put his ideas into English, instead of the Creole mixture of every known language that they use among themselves. Neither Coolies nor Chinese are employed on these cocoa estates, much to the satisfaction of the Creoles, who though tolerant of, or rather clinging to, European mastership, have little sympathy with other coloured or semi-civilised races. Some authors have indeed conjectured that the West Indian labourer of the future will be a cross-mixture of the African and the Asiatic; but to this conclusion, desirable or not, there is for the present no apparent tendency, either in Surinam or elsewhere. As to the Indians of these regions, they keep to themselves, and their incapacity of improvement, combined with hereditary laziness and acquired drunkenness, will, it seems, soon render them a mere memory, poetical or otherwise, of the past.

Soil, climate, and the conditions of labour, all here combine to favour the cocoa-plant; and accordingly, out of the thirty thousand acres actually under cultivation in Dutch Guiana, we find that a sixth part is dedicated to its production. More would be so, but for the time required before a fresh plantation can bear a remunerative crop; five or six years must, in fact, elapse during which no return at all is made, "which is a consideration" also, though in an opposite sense to that quoted above.

Cocoa prospers; but after all said and done, sugar, the one thing that for two centuries and more has been to the West Indies—Dutch, French, Spanish, or English—what cloth is to Manchester, cutlery to Sheffield, or beer to Bavaria, is even now, despite of emancipation, free-trade, beetroot, prohibitive regulations, American tariffs, and the whole array of adversities mustered against it for the last fifty years, the "favourite" of the agricultural racecourse, and holds with regard to other products, however valuable, the same position as the queen of the chessboard does when compared with the remaining pieces. Indeed in some—Demerara, for instance—sugar reigns, like Alexander Selkirk on his island, not only supreme, but alone; while in Surinam, where, more than in the generality of West-Indian regions, she has many and, to a certain extent, successful rivals to contend with, she vindicates a full half of the reclaimed soil for her exclusive domain. Previous to emancipation, four-fifths at least were her allotted share. No fuller evidence of her former sway need be sought than that which is even yet every-

where supplied by the aspect of the great houses, gardens, and all the belongings of the old sugar plantations, once the wealth and mainstay of the Dutch colony. The garb is now too often, alas, "a world too wide for the shank shanks" of the present, but it witnesses to the time when it was cut to fitness and measure.

And here on our way, almost opposite the cocoa-plantation with its modern and modest demesnes that we have just visited, appears the large sugar-estate of Voorburg, close behind Fort Amsterdam, at the junction point of the river. Let us land and gladden the heart of the manager—the owner is, like too many others, and the more the pity, an absentee—by a visit. Happy indeed would he be, in his own estimation at least, were we to comply with his well-meant request of riding round every acre and inspecting every cane on the grounds. But as these cover five hundred and sixty acres of actual cultivation, besides about a thousand more of yet unreclaimed concession; as the sun, too, is now high enough to be very hot, and we have other places to visit and sights to see, we will excuse ourselves as best we can, though by so doing we mark an indifference on our part to the beauties of the cane-field that he may forgive, but cannot comprehend.

I may remark by the way that in this respect every planter, every manager, Dutch, English, Scotch, or Irish, in the West Indies is exactly the same. None of them, in the intense and personal interest they take in every furrow, every cane, can understand how any one else can feel less; or how, to the uninitiated eye one acre of reed is very like another; one ditch resembles another ditch; just as the sheep in a flock are mere repetitions the one of the other to all but the shepherd; or as one baby resembles any baby to every apprehension except to that of the mother or, occasionally, the nurse. Let us, however, respect what we are not worthy to share; and do thou decline regretfully, O my friend, but firmly—if thou desirest not headache and twelve hours' subsequent stupefaction at the least—the friendly invitation to "ride round" the estates, in a sun heat say of 140° F., for two whole hours, it cannot be less; while a supercopious breakfast, and all kinds of cheerful but too seductive drinks, are awaiting you on your return. Accompany us rather on the quiet circuit we will now make about the house, the labourers' cottages, the outbuildings, and two, at most three, acres of cane, and when in futuro visiting on thy own account, go thou and do likewise.

Nor is even the following picture of Voorburg to be taken as a photographic likeness, but rather an idealised view, combining details taken from other subjects with those of the above-named locality, and true to many, indeed most, sugar estates of this region, because limited to the exact facts, statistical or pictorial, of none.

Wood or brick, more often the former, the landing-place or

"Stelling" receives us, and on traversing it we are at once welcomed by the shelter—half a minute's exposure to the sun will have made you desire it—of a cool, well-swept, well-trimmed avenue, most often, as it happens to be at Voorburg itself, of mahogany trees, dark and clustering, sometimes of light green almond-trees, or locust-trees, or it may be of palms, especially betel; this last selected rather for the perfect beauty of symmetry, in which it excels all other palms, than for shade. To this avenue, which may be from fifty to a hundred yards long, succeeds an open garden, laid out in walks where "caddie" does duty for gravel, and flower-beds in which roses, geraniums, verbenas, jessamines, and other well-known Europeanized flowers and plants, mix with their tropical rivals, of equal or greater beauty and sweetness; their names, ah me, I am no botanist; enough if wonderful passion-flowers, noble scarlet lilies, and gorgeous cactus-blossoms be mentioned here; Canon Kingsley's chapter on the Botanical Gardens of Trinidad may be safely consulted for the rest. Among the beds and garden-walks keep sentinel, in true Batavian fashion, quaint white-painted wooden statues, mostly classical after Lempière, "all heathen goddesses most rare," Venuses, Dianas, Apollos, Terpsichores, Fortunes on wheels, Bacchuses, Fawns, occasionally a William, a Van Tromp, or some other hero of Dutch land or main, these last recognisable by the vestiges of cocked hats and tail coats, as the former by the absence of those or any other articles of raiment; and all with their due proportion of mutilated noses, lopped hands, and the many injuries of sun, rain, and envious time.

But stay, I had almost forgotten to mention the two iron popguns, that command the landing place, and flank on either side the entry of the avenue; imitation cannon, that in everything except their greater size are the very counterparts of those "devilish engines" that our early childhood thought it a great achievement to load and fire off. Here the children's part is played not unsuccessfully by the negroes themselves, who at seventy years of age have no less pleasure than we ourselves might have felt at seven, in banging off their artillery in and out of all possible seasons, but especially on the approach of distinguished and popular visitors like His Excellency the Governor, with whom I am happily identified, so to speak, during this trip. But this is not all; for within the garden, close under the house windows are ranged two, four, or even six more pieces, some shaped like cannon, others like mortars; and these too are crammed up to their very mouths with powder and improvised wadding, and exploded on festive occasions; when, as ill-hap will have it, their over-repletion often results in bursting, and their bursting in the extemporised amputation of some negro arm, leg, or head, as the case may be. But though I heard of many a heartrending or limb-rending event of the kind, I am thankful to say that I witnessed none during our tour, though of explosions many.

Next a flight of steps, stone or brick, guarded by a handsome parapet in the Dutch style, and surmounted by a platform, with more or less of architectural pretension, leads up to the wide front door; by this we pass and find ourselves at once in the large entrance hall, that here, as formerly in European dwellings, serves for dining room and reception room generally. The solid furniture, of wood dark with age, gives it a quasi old-English look; and the gloom, for the light is allowed but a scanty entrance, lest her sister heat should enter too, is quasi English also. But the stiff portraits on the wall, ancestors, relatives, Netherland celebrities, royal personages, governors, &c., &c., are entirely Dutch and belong to the wooden school of art. The central table is of any given size and strength, and has been evidently calculated for any amount of guests and viands. We shall partake of the latter before leaving, and bestow well-merited praise on cook and cellar. Besides the hall are other apartments, counting-rooms, and so forth; above it is a second story, above it a third, for the brick walls are strong, and hurricanes are here as in Demerara unknown; over all rises a high-pitched roof; the wolf, or griffin, or lion, or whatever crest the original proprietor may have boasted, figures atop as gable ornament or vane. The whole forms a manor-house that might have been transported, by substantial Dutch cherubs of course, as the Loretto bauble was by slim Italian angioletts, from amid the poplars of Arnheim or Bredvoort, and set down on the banks of Commeweyne. Only the not unfrequent adjuncts of a trellised verandah, and a cool outside gallery, are manifestly not of extra-tropical growth.

We have received our welcome, and drunk our prelusory schnapps. And now for the sight-seeing. The factory, where the canes, crushed into mere fibre as fast as the negroes can lift them from the canal-barge alongside on to the insatiable rollers close by, give out their continuous green frothy stream, to be clarified, heated, boiled, reboiled, tormented fifty ways, till it finds refuge in the hogsheds or rum barrels; resembling in every stage of its course its counterpart in Demerara, or Jamaica, minus, however, except in one solitary instance, the expensive refinements of the centrifugal cylinder and vacuum pan. But for mere delectation, unless heat, vapour, noise, and an annihilation of everything in general be delectation, which I hardly think, no man need linger in a factory, nor, unless he desires premature intoxication on vapour, in a rum-distillery either. Worth attention, however, and admiration too, is the solidity of construction by which the huge mass of building, doubly heavy from the ponderous machinery it contains, besides its clustering group of out-houses, megass-sheds, tall chimneys, storerooms, and the rest, is enabled to support itself upright and unyielding on a soil so marshy and unstable. The foundations in many

instances, I am told, exceed by double in dimension the buildings above.

Ingenious bees these sugar-making ones. Let us next look at the hives of the workers. These workers, or, metaphor apart, labourers, are here, at Voorburg I mean, and on not a few other estates, of three kinds, Coolie, Chinese, and Creole. And, should any one, smitten with a desire for accuracy and statistics, wish to know their exact numbers in this particular instance, the Coolies at Voorburg are ninety all told, the Chinese one hundred and eighty-one, the Creolet or colonial-born negroes, two hundred.

First to the Coolies. Their introduction into Surinam is of recent date, little over two years, in fact ; but everything has been organized for them on exactly the same footing as in Demerara or Trinidad. They have their Agents, here and in India, their official protector, a very efficient one in the person of Mr. A. C——, Her Majesty's Consul ; their labour and pay regulations are textually identical with those of Demerara ; they are duly provided with a medical staff and hospitals ; in a word, they are, if anything, more fenced in here from every shadow of a grievance than even in an English colony ; Mr. Jenkins himself could not ask more for his protégés. The eye recognises at once the regulation cottages, all like pretty maids—but here the similarity ceases—of a row, with garden spaces attached, back yards, verandahs, and every attention paid by the constructors to dryness, ventilation, and whatever else a Parliamentary Inspector of the most practical type could desire. Thus much is done for the immigrants ; but except to amass money, with an occasional whiff at the hookah between times, from morning to night, the “mild Hindoo” is not inclined to do much for himself. His garden, ill planted and ill cared for, is a sorry sight ; his dwelling, for what concerns the interior, is a cross between a gypsy-hut and a rag-shop, and a pinched, stingy, meanness characterizes his every belonging no less than himself. That he may also excel, in “grace, ease, courtesy, self-restraint, dignity, sweetness, and light,” I am ready, of course, with all believers in “At Last,” to admit. But I do it on faith, the evidence of things not seen either in the West Indies or the East. Low-caste Hindoos in their own land are, to all ordinary apprehension, slovenly, dirty, ungraceful, generally unacceptable in person and surroundings ; and the Coolies of Voorburg may have been low-caste, very likely. Yet offensive as is the low-caste Indian, were I estate-owner, or colonial governor, I had rather see the lowest Pariahs of the low, than a single trim, smooth-faced, smooth-wayed, clever, high-caste Hindoo on my lands or in my colony.

But for the untidiness, I might say shiftlessness of the Surinam-planted Coolies, some allowance must be made. They are new comers, in a new land, among what are to them new races, and if it

takes some time even for the European under such like circumstances to pluck up heart and be a-doing, the process of adaptation is yet slower for the Asiatic. In Demerara, where they have now dwelt for years with Europeans to stimulate and direct them, and negroes to teach them gardening without doors and tidiness within, the Coolies certainly make a better show, and so do their dwellings. But they have much as yet to learn in Surinam.

Passing a dyke or two, we come next on the Chinese cottages, in construction and outward arrangement identical with those of the Coolies, or nearly so. The gardens here show a decided improvement, not indeed in the shape of flowers, or of any of the pretty graceful things of the soil, for of such there are none here; but there are useful vegetables and potherbs in plenty; spade and hoe, manure and water, care and forethought, have done their work and are receiving their reward. But the inside of a Chinese dwelling—*guarda e passa*. Well, Chinamen are fond of pigs, and if they have a fancy themselves to live in pigstyes, it is all in character.

A dyke or two more has to be crossed, and we enter the Creole village. Here regulation has done less, and individual will and fancy more. But the negroes are Dutch trained, and have an idea of straight lines and orderly rows, by no means African; though in the English-like preference given to isolated dwellings in which each household can live apart, over conjoint ones, they do but follow the custom of their ancestral birth-place. Their gardens are well-stocked, not with fruit and vegetables only, with plantains, mangoes, bananas, yams, sweet-potatoes, peas, and the like things good for food, but also with whatever is pleasant to the eye; with gay flowers, twining creepers, bright berries, scarlet and black; in fine, with the brilliant colours and strong contrasts that besit African taste. Inside their dwellings are comfortable, and in most instances clean, neatly arranged too, though the space is very often overcrowded with furniture, the tables covered with cheap glass and crockery, more for show than use, and the walls hung round with a confused medley of gaudy prints. These Creoles evidently know how to enjoy life, and have resolved to make the best of it; the wisest resolution, it may be, for us mortals in our little day.

Enough of Creoles, Chinese, and Coolies for this once; we are yet at the outset of our voyage. Returning towards the factory, we pay a visit to the airy and well-constructed hospital; sore-feet seem the principal complaint. The climate is, in itself, a healthy one; epidemics are rare, marsh-fever scarcely heard of, and yellow-fever, like cholera, a historical event of years past. Hence disease when it occurs is mostly traceable to some distinct cause of individual folly, unreasonable custom, or, as is frequently the case with the self-stinting Coolie, insufficient diet. Nor is there any doubt that

here, as in almost every other West Indian colony—Demerara is one of the few honourable exceptions—sanitary regulations and medical service are far from their best. Let them be reformed, as they easily may, and the inhabitant, European or other, of the Guiana coast will have no reason to complain of his lot, so far as climate is concerned, even when contrasted with the bracing atmosphere and invigorating breezes of the northern sea-shore.

A look at the truly regal King-Palm, an African importation, and said to be the only specimen in the colony, that waves its crown of dense fronds, each thirty and forty feet long, in front of the Voorburg residence, and we re-embark; not sorry, after the hot sunshine we have endured, to find ourselves once more under the boat-awning in the temperate river breeze.

In a few minutes more we have rounded the point of Fort Amsterdam, where of course flags are flying and officers and soldiers in all the glory of uniform are hastily marshalling themselves alongside of the battery at the water's edge to greet his Excellency, who, hat in hand, acknowledges their salutations from the deck. And now, with the tide to help, we are steaming up the giant Commeweyne, and enter straight on a scene of singular beauty, and a character all its own. For breadth of stream, indeed, and colour or discolour of water, the river hereabouts, that is for about twenty miles of its lower course, might fairly pass for the Danube anywhere between Orsova and Widdin, or perhaps for a main-branch of the Nile about Benha, with the sole discrepancy that whereas the Commeweyne, thanks to the neighbouring Atlantic, is tidal, the two last-named tributaries of the tideless Mediterranean and Black Seas are not so. But that large reddish water-snake, that writhes its ugly way up the current; that timber-raft of rough-hewn but costly materials, bearing on its planks the tall naked African figures that guide its way; that light Indian corial, balanced as venturesomely as any Oxford skiff, and managed by a boatman as skilful, however ragged his clothes, and reckless his seeming, as the precise Oxford undergraduate; that gleaming gondola-like barge, with its covered cabin—is the reclining form within dark or fair?—and its cheery-singing crew—all these are objects not of Bulgarian, nor even, though not absolutely dissimilar, of Egyptian river-life. The hot light mirrored on the turbid water, the moist hot breeze, the intense hot stillness of earth and sky, between which the very river seems as if motionless, and sleeping in the monotony of its tepid flow—these also are unknown to the Nile of the Cairene Delta, or the Turko-Wallachian Danube; they belong to a more central zone. Details of the sort might, however, be every one of them, the “bush negroes” and the covered Dutch barges excepted—equally well found, as I myself can bear witness, on the Essequibo, the Demerara, or any

other of the neighbouring Guiana-coast rivers. But not so the scarce interrupted succession of estates, sugar, cocoa, and plantain, to the right and left, each with its quaint name, most often Dutch, telling some tale of the hopes, cares, expectations, anxieties, affections, joys, sorrows, of former owners long ago.

Various as were the early fortunes of the "Estates," their later times have been to the full as varied, or perhaps more. Some have by good management, backed with the requisite capital, retained through all vicissitudes of trade and strife, of slavery, apprenticeship, and emancipation, a sufficiency of Creole labour to keep all or the greater part of their old West-Indian prosperity; and announce themselves accordingly as we sail past, by smoking chimneys, roofs and walls in good repair, and clustering cottages, amid the dense green of cocoa groves, or the verdant monotony of sugar-canes, only interrupted at regular distances by canal and dyke, or by some long palm row, planted more for beauty than for profit. In the distance towers a huge cotton-tree, magnificent to look at, but useless else, and chiefly spared to humour negro superstition, that yet brings offerings of food and drink to the invisible power, rather maleficent than otherwise, supposed to reside under its boughs. Or, again, signs of recent additions and improvements, with long white rows of regulation-built cottages, the tenements of Coolies or Chinese, attest fortunes not only maintained but improved by the infusion of "new blood" from the Indian or the Celestial Empire. Or a reverse process has taken place; the cane has abdicated in favour of less costly, but also less remunerative rivals; and the white proprietor has made place for a black landowner, or more commonly for several, who now cultivate the land in accordance with their narrow means. Here the emerald monotony of the land is broken; patches of cassava-growth, like an infinity of soft green cupolas, crowded one on the other, and undulating to every breath of air, show chequerwise between acres where the metallic glitter of vigorous plantain leaves, or tall hop-like rows of climbing yam, tell of an unexhausted and seemingly inexhaustible soil. Jotted freely amid the lesser growths, fruit trees of every kind spread unpruned with a luxuriance that says more for the quantity than the quality of their crop; but this is the tropical rule, and even Dutch gardening skill is unavailing against the exuberance of growth in climates like these. Meanwhile, the stately residence of the former proprietor, who by the way had in all probability been for many years an absentee, before, by a natural result he became a bankrupt—the transition is a stereotyped one, and recurs every day—has at last been totally abandoned as out of keeping with the simpler requirements of his successors. They content themselves with small cottages half-buried in a medley of flower-bushes, and

kitchen-growth close by; though in more than one instance our Creole, reverting to the hereditary Oriental instinct of ease and how to take it, has built himself on the green margin of some creek or river inlet, a pretty painted kiosk, worthy of finding place among its likenesses on the shores of the Bosphorus or Nile, and answering the same ends. An unroofed factory and ruined chimney close by combine to mark the present phase, a necessary though a transient one, of land ownership, through which Surinam is passing; a more hopeful one, though less brilliant, than that of exclusively large Estates and costly factories owned by few.

I am again,—for this is not a diary, where everything is put down according to the order in which it occurred, but rather a landscape picture, where I take the liberty of arranging accessories as best may suit convenience or effect,—I am again on board our steamer onward bound with the rest. Sometimes our course lies along the centre of the river, and then we have a general view of either side, far off, but seen in that clearness of atmosphere unknown to the northern climes, which, while it abolishes the effects of distance, creates a curious illusion, making the smallness of the remoter objects appear not relative but absolute. Sharp-edged and bright-coloured in the sun, houses and cottages stand out in an apparent fore-ground of tree and field; miniature dwellings, among a miniature vegetation; with liliputian likenesses of men and women between. Then, again, we approach one or the other bank; and see! the little palm-model is sixty feet high at least, and the gabled toy-house a large mansion three or four storeys high. And now the fields and gardens reach down to the very brink of the stream, and our approach has been watched by the labourers from far; so that by the time we are gliding alongside, troops of blacks, men and women, the former having hastily slipped on their white shirts, the latter rearranged their picturesque head-kerchiefs of every device and colour, gala fashion, hurry down to the landing-place for a welcome. Some bear with them little Dutch or fancy flags, others, the children especially, have wild flowers in their hands; two or three instruments of music, or what does duty for them, are heard in the crowd; and a dense group forms, with the eager seriousness befitting the occasion about the two dwarf cannon by the wharveside, which are now banged off amid the triumphant shouts of the one sex and the screams of the other. We, on the deck and paddle-boxes, return the greetings as best we may, the Governor waves his hat, fresh shouts follow; till the popular excitement—on shore, be it understood—takes the form of a dance, begun for our delectation, and continued for that of the dancers themselves, long after we have glided away. White dresses, dashed here and there by a sprinkling of gay colours; behind them a glowing screen of garden flowers,

further back and all around the emerald green of cane-fields, overhead tall palms, not half seared and scant of foliage as we too frequently see them in the wind-swept islands of the Caribbean archipelago, but luxuriant with their heavy crowns; or giant flowering trees, crimson and yellow, the whole flooded, penetrated everywhere by the steady brightness of the tropical day,—

“Till all things seem only one
In the universal sun,”

a gay sight, and harmonizing well with the sounds of welcome, happiness, and mirth. These tell, not indeed perhaps of all-absorbing industry, of venturesome speculation, and colossal success, but of sufficiency, contentment, and well-doing,—good things too in their way.

CHAPTER IV.

COTTICA.

“—a leaf on the one great tree, that up from old time
(growing, contains in itself the whole of the virtue and life of
Bygone days, drawing now to itself all kindreds and nations,
And must have for itself the whole world for its root and branches.”

CLOUGH.

DURING the whole of the eighteenth century Fort Sommelsdyk continued to be a position of the greatest importance, covering the bulk of the colonial estates and the capital itself from the frequent inroads of Cayenne depredators, and their allies, the French maroons. With the final repression of these marauders, the military duties of the post may be said to have ceased; and it has now for several years served only as a police station. No spot could have been better chosen; no truer centre found anywhere. Not only does the Com-meweyne River, with its double fringe of estates and cultivation reaching far to the south, here unite with its main tributary, the Cottica, the eastern artery of a wide and populous district; but the same way gives direct access to the Perica River, another important affluent from the south-east; while at a little distance the Matappica water-course branches off in a northerly direction, and winding amid a populous region of plantations and cane-fields, finds an opening to the sea beyond. Half the cultivation, and, owing to the character of the estates, more than half the rural population of Dutch Guiana, are within the range of these districts; and the selection of this post will ever remain a proof of the administrative, no less than of the military talents of Van Sommelsdyk.

The small fort, a pentagon, erected on a grass-grown promontory

at the meeting of the two great waters, has a very pretty appearance. On every side the further view is shut off by the dense forest through which the rivers make their winding way by channels from thirty to forty feet in depth ; no other habitation is in sight ; and the cleared space around the fort buildings has an out-of-the-world look, befitting a scene of weird adventure in "Mabinogion" or the "Fairie Queene." But the poetry of the New World is in itself, not in the eyes of those who behold it ; and if fairies exist west of the Atlantic, they are invisible for the most. Above its junction, the Commeweyne changes character, and instead of being a broad, slow-flowing volume of brackish water, becomes a comparatively narrow, but deep and rapid stream ; while its former muddy colour is exchanged for pure black, not unlike the appearance of the mid-Atlantic depths in its inky glassiness. If taken up, however, in small quantity, the black colour, which is due chiefly to the depth, gives place to a light yellow ; otherwise the water is clear, free from any admixture of mud, and perfectly healthy, with a slightly astringent taste. These peculiarities are popularly ascribed to some vegetable extract of the nature of tannin, derived from the decomposing substances of the equatorial forest, underneath which these rivers take their rise.

We for our part no longer pursue our voyage on the Commeweyne, but diverging, follow its tributary—or rather an equal stream—the Cottica, and our course is henceforth east, almost parallel with the sea-line, though at some distance from it. From Fort Sommelsdyk onwards, the view on either bank gains in beauty what it loses in extent. The bendings and turnings of the river are innumerable ; indeed, it not rarely coils itself on itself in an almost circular loop, the nearest points of which have been in many instances artificially connected by a short but deep and navigable canal, the work of Dutch industry. Several little islands, each an impenetrable mass of tangled vegetation, have thus been formed ; on two larger ones, far up the river, coffee is still grown. It was for many years one of the main articles of cultivation in these districts, though now it has fallen into unmerited neglect ; whence it will doubtless be rescued whenever a better proportioned labour supply shall allow the colonists to reoccupy and extend the narrow limits within which their activity is at present restricted. Several creeks, as all lesser watercourses are here called, fall into the main stream, or from distance to distance connect it, by the aid of canals, with the sea. On the banks of one of these flourished, in days gone by, the still famous Helena, a Mulatto syren, whose dusky charms are said to have rivalled in their mischievous effects, if not in other respects, those of her Grecian namesake. These creeks, with the canals and ditches dependent on them, complete the water-system alike of irrigation and traffic throughout this wonderful land, where nature has done so much,

and art and skill yet more. But whatever the sea communication through these occasional openings, no brackish taint ever finds its way to the higher level, through which the Cottica flows; and the freshness of the water is betokened by the ever-increasing loveliness and variety of the riverside vegetation. Lowest down hangs the broad fringe of the large-leaved "moço-moco"—a plant that has, I suppose, some authentic Latin name, only I know it not; nor would it, however appropriate, give thee, perhaps, gentle reader, any clearer idea of the plant than may its Indian one,—dipping its glossy green clusters into the very stream. Above tower all the giants of West Indian and South American forests, knit together by endless meshes of convolvulus, liane, creeper, and wild vine, the woorali, I am told, among the rest; and surcharged with parasites, till the burden of a single tree seems sufficient to replenish all the hothouses of England and Wales from store to roof. Piercing through these, the eta-palm—it resembles in growth the toddy-palm of the East Indies, and, for aught my ignorance can object to the contrary, may be the very same—waves its graceful fans high against the steady blue; and birds innumerable—black, white, mottled, plain, blue, yellow, crimson, long-billed, parrot-billed, a whole aviary let loose—fly among the boughs, or strut fearless between the tree-trunks, or stand mid-leg deep, meditative, in the water. Large lizards abound on the banks, and snakes too, it may be, but they have the grace to keep out of sight, along with the jaguars and other unpleasant occupants of the Guiana jungle. In their stead light corials, sometimes with only a woman to paddle, sometimes a man or boy, dart out of the harbour-like shelter of the creeks; bush-negro families peer curiously from the doors of their floating cottages, or guide their timber-rafts down the stream. Ever and anon a white painted barque, conveying an overseer, a book-keeper, or some other of the white or semi-white gentry, rows quickly by, for the river is the highway, and the wayfarers along it many: so that even where its banks are at the loneliest, the stream itself has life and activity enough to show. More often, however, it passes between cultivated lands: for while the factories and sugar estates diminish in number as we go further up, the small Creole properties increase; and comfortable little dwellings, places, cottages, sheds, and out-houses, amid every variety of "provision ground" cultivation, multiply along the bank. Here, too, even more than along the Comweyne, men in every variety of costume—from the raggedest half-nakedness that in this climate betokens, not exactly want, but rather hard out-door work, to the white trousers and black coat, the badges of the upper-class negro Creole—and a yet greater number of women, who have fortunately not learned to exchange the becoming and practical turban of their race for the ridiculous hat and bonnet

of European fashion, come down to honour the Governor's passage ; nor does the blazing afternoon sun, now at his hottest, seem to have the least effect on the energy of their welcome. And I may add that not here only, and in the more secluded districts of the colony, but throughout its entire extent, I neither saw nor heard of anything indicating, however remotely, the duality of feeling that in so many other West Indian settlements—the Danish most—draws a line of separation, if not hostility, between the black and the white inhabitants of the land. The Creoles of Surinam are not less loyal to the Dutch tricolor than the burghers of Leyden, and King William himself could hardly expect a more affectionately enthusiastic greeting, were he to make a tour through the seven Provinces, than his representative receives when visiting his Transatlantic subjects of the same rule. And in this matter, observation is confirmed by history ; nor since the conclusion, in 1777, of the long and bloody Maroon wars, has a single outbreak or show of insubordination disturbed the interior harmony of Dutch Guiana.

For this happy state of things, contrasting so advantageously with the records of too many other neighbouring colonies, the wise and kindly rule of an enlightened Government has been, of course, the principal promoter and cause. But no small share of the praise is also due to the truest friends and best guides Europe has ever supplied to the African race, the Moravian brothers. More fortunate than their compeers of Jamaica and its sister-islands, the Surinam slaves fell to the share of these Moravian teachers, who had already as far back as 1735 organized settlements among the Indians of the interior with much labour and little result. It is remarkable that almost the only teachers who have met with any success—and indeed their success, so to call it, has been considerable, among the Indians of the two Continents south and north—are Roman Catholic priests. A sensuous idolatry best fits a sensuous good-for-nothing race. Whereas when a Catholic missionary suggested to a bush-negro the other day the propriety of exchanging his hereditary worship of the cotton-tree for that of an imaged Virgin Mary, the black is reported to have answered, "God made our idol, man made yours ; and, besides, ours is the finer of the two," and accordingly declined the exchange. "*Se non è vero, è ben trovato.*"

But to return to the Moravians. When, after some difficulty, though less than might have been anticipated from the nature of things, on the masters' part, they were allowed to turn their attention to the slaves, their success was as rapid as it was well-deserved. In 1776 the first negro was baptized and admitted as a member of the congregation, and the countenance publicly and generously given on the occasion by the Governor of the colony

marked this step with the importance of a historical event. The very same year a Moravian teaching establishment was opened on one of the Commeweyne estates, others followed, and long before the emancipation of 1863, three-fourths of the working negroes had been numbered in the Moravian ranks. The latest census gives nineteen Moravian schools, attended by more than two thousand two hundred children, while over twenty-four thousand names, all Creole, are inscribed in the register of the Herrnhut brotherhood.

That the emancipation, too long deferred, of 1863, was neither preceded, accompanied, nor followed in Dutch Guiana by any disturbances like those which agitated Jamaica, Demerara, and other settlements thirty years before; that apprenticeship, so signal a failure elsewhere, here proved a success; that when this too came to its appointed end in 1873, scarce one among the thousand of Creole labourers on the estates struck work, or took advantage of his new completeness of freedom to give himself up to idleness and vagabond life—these things are mainly due, so the colonists acknowledge, to the spirit of subordination, industry, and order inspired in their pupils by the Moravian teachers. Alike untinged by Baptist restlessness and Methodist fanaticism, their loyalty and good sense had prepared a people worthy of the rights into the enjoyment of which they at last entered; they had made of the slaves under their tutorial care, not only, as the phrase goes, good Christians, but they had also made of them what the majority of other teachers had failed to do, good citizens and good subjects; loyal to their government, respectful to their superiors, orderly among themselves. Obeah and poisoning, serious crimes indeed in any form, are almost unknown in Dutch Guiana; camp-meetings and the disgraceful extravagances of “native Baptist” preachers, mountebanks, and demagogues entirely so.

Liberty of conscience and the freedom of every man to choose and follow whatever religion he will, are very good things; yet even their warmest supporter would hardly hesitate to bring up his children by preference in that form of religion to which he himself belongs. Negroes in their present phase are children; when newly emancipated they might have been more properly termed babies; and there would certainly have been then no harm, nor even much difficulty, in prescribing for them some one of the many modes of Christianity best adapted to their comprehension and capabilities. And of all modes the Moravian, with its simple creed, simple though emotional worship, strict discipline, and absence of priestly caste-ship, would I venture to think have been the best.

These reflections, which, so far as they are merely reflections, the reader-companion of my trip is free to adopt or reject as he pleases, have in this my narrative derived their origin from the sight of the barn-like buildings of the Moravian establishment called of Char-

lottenburg alongside of which we are now borne on the clear black depths of the Cottica. The high-roofed conventual-looking mansion occupied by teachers themselves has a somewhat German air; the chapel, school-house, and cattle-sheds, from which last, with garden cultivation and farming work on a small scale, the mission is chiefly supported, are all spacious and all plain even to ugliness. If we enter the buildings, we shall see little more, or in truth nothing whatever, to gratify the artistic sense. Within as without, any approach to ornamentation, not decorative only, but architectural even, is strictly excluded; though whether for reasons of economy or on some abstract principle, I do not know. Perhaps it is a speculative craze, for why should not the Moravians have crazes of their own like other denominations? However, as this fancy, if fancy it be, does not interfere with the practical utility of the constructions, which are cool, roomy, well-aired, and well-kept, want of beauty may be pardoned though deplored. The interior arrangements, too, offer nothing to make a description interesting. A school-room, an elementary one especially, is much the same all the world over, whether the scholars be black or white; and the same may be said of a meeting-house and its contents. But as I have already said, they answer the purposes they were intended for, and in addition they really come up to the popular idea. Private dwellings, by African rule of taste, should be small, mere sleeping-coverts in fact, with an open verandah or shed tacked on, it may be, but as little construction as possible. Public buildings, on the contrary, cannot be too large. For decoration, the African eye has no great discernment; it appreciates bright colours and their combinations, but that is nearly all. In form, imitative form especially, they are at the very first letter of the art alphabet; nor were the most gifted of their kind, the ancient Egyptians, much further advanced in either respect. What then can be expected from the West Coast national type? But like the princes of their brotherhood, the light-coloured Africans of the Nile valley, the Congo negro, and the naturalised South-American Creole, understand the value of size in architecture as well as Mr. Fergusson himself, though not equally able perhaps to give the reason of the value; and the spacious assembly-room and wide enclosure of a central African palace, or a Surinam negro meeting-place, are the legitimate though somewhat feeble and degenerate descendants of the giant structures of Carnac.

Cottages and gardens extend far away to the right and left of the open space where stands the central establishment; cocoa-nut trees form a conspicuous and a very agreeable figure in the general landscape. Sir Charles Dilke asserts, correctly, I take for granted, that two hundred thousand acres of Ceylon land are shaded by cocoa-

palms, yielding from seven to eight hundred million cocoa-nuts a year, and worth two millions sterling. Amen. There is no reason, or, to put it better, no hindrance, either of climate or soil, to prevent the mainland Dutch settlement of the West from rivalling or excelling in this respect the once Dutch island of the East. Nor is much labour, nor much expense, beyond the first outlay of planting, required. Yet even for these, men and capital are alike wanting. Well, everything has its day; and Surinam, when her time comes, may be the garden of Guiana; she is, for nineteen-twentieths of her extent, more like the shrubbery now.

Meanwhile the current and the boat are bearing us on round another curve of the bank; the glittering plantain-screen and the infinite interlacings of the cocoa-leaves have closed round the green gap with its long-roofed dwellings; last of all, the small painted belfry has, so to speak, been swallowed up among the boughs, and "all the landscape is remade." Here is a remarkably large and handsome residence, with an avenue down to the water's edge, and landing-place to match; the garden, too, and the statues amid its flowers, look more numerous and more fantastic than common; the factory is in good working order; the sheds full of megass, the out-houses stocked—everything betokens a prosperous condition; the negroes at the wharf salute us with flags, popguns, and what they are pleased to call singing, as we approach. I inquire the name of the place; it is Munnikendam, the Governor informs me; adding that the estate is remarkable for the conservative tenacity with which, amid all the changes that have from time to time come over the spirit of the colonial dream, it has maintained old customs, old feelings, old manners and modes of life. Certainly we are now in what may be termed an out-of-the-way corner, not far from the very extreme limits of European habitation, and central influences may have been slow in diffusing themselves by Dutch barges up this secluded winding river. Nevertheless, to my English eye, the busiest districts of the colony, and the capital itself, had already appeared remarkably conservative. Not wholly stationary, for progress there certainly is; but it is progress by line and rule, precept and measure, here a little and there a little; not on the sweeping scale, or by the rapid transitions ordinary in the empirical regions of the New World. So that, thought I, if Paramaribo be comparatively not conservative, the conservatism of Munnikendam must be something worth the studying. The Governor assented, and by his order a message was shouted across the stream that on our return we would pay the good folks of the estate a visit, and we continued our way.

My readers will, I hope, accompany us on our visit to Munnikendam, in the following chapter, and derive from it as much pleasure in idea as we ourselves did in actual fact. Just now,

however, the immediate goal to which we were bound was the estate entitled "La Paix," the remotest of all European settlements, or farms, from the colonial centre, bordering on what was once the military frontier, between which and the Marowynne River the land lies yet open and unreclaimed. East of the Marowynne commences Surinam's old rival and plunderer—French Cayenne. The distance of La Paix from the capital, in a straight line, is about fifty miles; following the river windings, it cannot be much short of a hundred.

The Cottica in this part of its course, and above its junction with the Perica, which flows into it a little below Munnikendam, is narrow, often not exceeding eighty yards in width, but extremely deep; the banks, where they have not been cleared for cultivation, or planted over with fruit-trees, are a tangled maze of forest, under-wood, creeper, leaf, flower, thorn, through which a cat or a snake could hardly find a way. Coffee-bushes, the abandoned relics of plantation, mingle freely with the native growth; tall palms shoot up everywhere; bamboo tufts bend gracefully over the stream; water-lilies, pink, white, and yellow, float on the ink-black waters. From space to space the opening of some small natural creek, or artificial canal, enlarges the vista, green and flower-starred, to its furthest reach. Amid these, Creole cottages and gardens, cocoa-nut and banana plantations, abound and prosper; there is no sign of insecurity anywhere, still less of want. A mile or so before we reach La Paix, we pass the large dwelling-house called "Groot Marseille;" it is inhabited by three Creole negroes, the joint proprietors of the adjoining sugar estate. And these land-owning brethren, though thriving, live together, strange to say, in unity.

La Paix itself, with its seventeen hundred and sixty acres of grant, though not more than one-third of them are under actual cultivation, is a fine sugar estate; the fertility of the soil is evidently only limited by the amount of labour bestowed on it; and the employment of Coolies speaks well for the corresponding amount of capital invested. Yet the place has a half wild, frontier look; and in the struggle between the industry of man, and the excessive productiveness of nature, the latter seems ever and anon almost on the point of gaining the upper hand. Long grass and fantastic undergrowth shoot up wherever the smallest vacancy is left; the cane-patch shows like a little island, surrounded by an encroaching tide of trees; and the tall branches overshadowing cottage and outhouse, give the habitations a backwood settlement appearance—doubtful and undecided.

And here, on the twilight verge, where the extremest rays of civilisation blend with the dark margin of savage, or, at any rate, non-civilised existence beyond, let us pause awhile.

W. G. PALGRAVE.

THE POSTULATES OF ENGLISH POLITICAL ECONOMY.

No. I.

ADAM SMITH completed the *Wealth of Nations* in 1776, and our English political economy is therefore just a hundred years old. In that time it has had a wonderful effect. The life of almost everyone in England—perhaps of everyone—is different and better in consequence of it. The whole commercial policy of the country is not so much founded on it as instinct with it. Ideas which are paradoxes everywhere else in the world are accepted axioms here as results of it. No other form of political philosophy has ever had one thousandth part the influence on us; its teachings have settled down into the common sense of the nation, and have become irreversible.

We are too familiar with the good we have thus acquired to appreciate it properly. To do so we should see what our ancestors were taught. The best book on Political Economy published in England before that of Adam Smith is Sir James Stuart's *Inquiry*, a book full of acuteness, and written by a man of travel and cultivation. And its teaching is of this sort:—

“In all trade two things are to be considered in the commodity sold. The first is the matter; the second is the labour employed to render this matter useful.

“The matter exported from a country is what the country loses; the price of the labour exported is what it gains.

“If the value of the matter imported be greater than the value of what is exported the country gains. If a greater value of labour be imported than exported the country loses. Why? Because in the first case strangers must have paid *in matter* the surplus of labour exported; and in the second place because the strangers must have paid to strangers *in matter* the surplus of labour imported. It is therefore a general maxim to discourage the importation of work, and to encourage the exportation of it.”

It was in a world where *this* was believed that our present Political Economy began.

Abroad the influence of our English system has of course not been nearly so great as in England itself. But even there it has had an enormous effect. All the highest financial and commercial legislation of the Continent has been founded upon it. As curious a testimony perhaps as any to its power is to be found in the memoir of Mollien—the financial adviser of the first Napoleon, *le bon Mollien*, whom nothing would induce him to discard because his administration brought *frances*, whereas that of his more showy competitors might after all end in *ideas*.

"It was then," says Mollien, in giving an account of his youth, "that I read an English book of which the disciples whom M. Turgot had left spake with the greatest praise—the work of Adam Smith. I had especially remarked how warmly the venerable and judicious Malesherbes used to speak of it—this book so deprecated by all the men of the old routine who spoke of themselves so improperly as of the school of Colbert. They seemed to have persuaded themselves that the most important thing for our nation was that not one *sou* should ever leave France; that so long as this was so the kind and the amount of taxation, the rate of wages, the greater or less perfection of industrial arts, were things of complete indifference, provided always that one Frenchman gained what another Frenchman lost."

And he describes how the Wealth of Nations led him to abandon those absurdities and to substitute the views with which we are now so familiar, but on which the "good Mollien" dwells as on new paradoxes. In cases like this one instance is worth a hundred arguments. We see in a moment the sort of effect that our English Political Economy has had when we find it guiding the finance of Napoleon, who hated ideologues, and who did not love the English.

But notwithstanding these triumphs, the position of our Political Economy is not altogether satisfactory. It lies rather dead in the public mind. Not only it does not excite the same interest as formerly, but there is not exactly the same confidence in it. Younger men either do not study it, or do not feel that it comes home to them, and that it matches with their most living ideas. New sciences have come up in the last few years with new modes of investigation, and they want to know what is the relation of economical science, as their fathers held it, to these new thoughts and these new instruments. They ask, often hardly knowing it, will this "science," as it claims to be, harmonize with what we now know to be sciences, or bear to be tried as we now try sciences? And they are not sure of the answer.

Abroad, as is natural, the revolt is more avowed. Indeed, though the Political Economy of Adam Smith penetrated deep into the continent, what has been added in England since has never done so equally; though if our "science" is true, the newer work required a greater intellectual effort, and is far more complete as a scientific achievement than anything which Adam Smith did himself. Political Economy, as it was taught by Ricardo, has had in this respect much the same fate as another branch of English thought of the same age, with which it has many analogies—jurisprudence as it was taught by Austin and Bentham; it has remained insular. I do not mean that it was not often read and understood, of course it was so, though it was often misread and misunderstood. But it never at all reigned abroad as it reigns here; never was really fully accepted in other countries as it was here where it arose. And no theory, economical or political, can now be both insular and secure; foreign

thoughts come soon and trouble us; there will always be doubt here as to what is only believed here.

There are, no doubt, obvious reasons why English Political Economy should be thus unpopular out of England. It is known everywhere as the theory "of Free Trade," and out of England free trade is almost everywhere unpopular. Experience shows that no belief is so difficult to create, and no one so easy to disturb. The protectionist creed rises like a weed in every soil. "Why," M. Thiers was asked, "do you give these bounties to the French sugar refiners?" "I wish," replied he, "the tall chimneys to smoke." Every nation wishes prosperity for some conspicuous industry. At what cost to the consumer, by what hardship to less conspicuous industries, that prosperity is obtained, it does not care. Indeed, it hardly knows, it will never read, it will never apprehend the refined reasons which prove those evils and show how great they are; the visible picture of the smoking chimneys absorbs the whole mind. And, in many cases, the eagerness of England in the free-trade cause only does that cause harm. Foreigners say, "Your English traders are strong and rich; of course you wish to under-sell our traders, who are weak and poor. You have invented this Political Economy to enrich yourselves and ruin us; we will see that you shall not do so."

And that English political economy is more opposed to the action of government in all ways than most such theories, brings it no accession of popularity. All governments like to interfere; it elevates their position to make out that they can cure the evils of mankind. And all zealots wish they should interfere, for such zealots think they can and may convert the rulers and manipulate the state control: it is a distinct object to convert a definite man, and if he will not be convinced there is always a hope of his successor. But most zealots dislike to appeal to the mass of mankind; they know instinctively that it will be too opaque and impenetrable for them.

But I do not believe that these are the only reasons why our English political economy is not estimated at its value abroad. I believe that this arises from its special characteristic, from that which constitutes its peculiar value, and, paradoxical as it may seem, I also believe that this same characteristic is likewise the reason why it is often not thoroughly understood in England itself. The science of political economy as we have it in England may be defined as the science of business, as business is in large productive and trading communities. It is an analysis of that world so familiar to many Englishmen—the "great commerce" by which England has become rich. It assumes the principal facts which make that commerce possible, and as is the way of an abstract science it isolates and simplifies them; it detaches them from the confusion with which they

are mixed in fact. And it deals too with the men who carry on that commerce, and who make it possible. It assumes a sort of human nature such as we see it everywhere around us, and again it simplifies that human nature; it looks at one part of it only. Dealing with matters of "business," it assumes that man is actuated only by motives of business. It assumes that every man who makes anything, makes it for money, that he always makes that which brings him in most at least cost, and that he will make it in the way that will produce most and spend least; it assumes that every man who buys, buys with his whole heart, and that he who sells, sells with his whole heart, each wanting to gain all possible advantage. Of course we know that this is not so, that men are not like this; but we assume it for simplicity's sake, as an hypothesis. And this deceives many excellent people, for from deficient education they have very indistinct ideas what an abstract science is.

More competent persons, indeed, have understood that English political economists are not speaking of real men, but of imaginary ones; not of men as we see them, but of men as it is convenient to us to suppose they are. But even they often do not understand that the world which our political economists treat of is a very limited and peculiar world also. They often imagine that what they read is applicable to all states of society, and to all equally, whereas it is only true of—and only proved as to—states of society in which commerce has largely developed, and where it has taken the form of development, or something near the form, which it has taken in England.

This explains why abroad the science has not been well understood. Commerce, as we have it in England, is not so full-grown anywhere else as it is here—at any rate, is not so out of the lands populated by the Anglo-Saxon race. Here it is not only a thing definite and observable, but about the most definite thing we have, the thing which it is most difficult to help seeing. But on the continent, though there is much that is like it, and though that much is daily growing more, there is nowhere the same pervading entity—the same patent, pressing, and unmistakable object.

And this brings out too the inherent difficulty of the subject—a difficulty which no other science, I think, presents in equal magnitude. Years ago I heard Mr. Cobden say at a League Meeting that "Political Economy was the highest study of the human mind, for that the physical sciences required by no means so hard an effort." An orator cannot be expected to be exactly precise, and of course political economy is in no sense the highest study of mind—there are others which are much higher, for they are concerned with things much nobler than wealth or money; nor is it true that the effort of mind which political economy requires is nearly as great as that

required for the abstruser theories of physical science, for the theory of gravitation, or the theory of natural selection; but, nevertheless, what Mr. Cobden meant had—as was usual with his first-hand mind—a great fund of truth. He meant that political economy—effectual political economy, political economy which in complex problems succeeds—is a very difficult thing; something altogether more abstruse and difficult, as well as more conclusive, than that which many of those who rush in upon it have a notion of. It is an abstract science which labours under a special hardship. Those who are conversant with its abstractions are usually without a true contact with its facts; those who are in contact with its facts have usually little sympathy with and little cognizance of its abstractions. Literary men who write about it are constantly using what a great teacher calls “unreal words”—that is, they are using expressions with which they have no complete vivid picture to correspond. They are like physiologists who have never dissected; like astronomers who have never seen the stars; and, in consequence, just when they seem to be reasoning at their best, their knowledge of the facts falls short. Their primitive picture fails them, and their deduction altogether misses the mark—sometimes, indeed, goes astray so far, that those who live and move among the facts, boldly say that they cannot comprehend “how any one can talk such nonsense.” While, on the other hand, these people who live and move among the facts often, or mostly, cannot of themselves put together any precise reasonings about them. Men of business have a solid judgment—a wonderful guessing power of what is going to happen—each in his own trade; but they have never practised themselves in reasoning out their judgments and in supporting their guesses by argument; probably if they did so some of the finer and correcter parts of their anticipations would vanish. They are like the sensible lady to whom Coleridge said, “Madam, I accept your conclusion, but you must let me find the logic for it.” Men of business can no more put into words much of what guides their life than they could tell another person how to speak their language. And so the “theory of business” leads a life of obstruction, because theorists do not see the business, and the men of business will not reason out the theories. Far from wondering that such a science is not completely perfect, we should rather wonder that it exists at all.

Something has been done to lessen the difficulty by statistics. These give tables of facts which help theoretical writers and keep them straight, but the cure is not complete. Writers without experience of trade are always fancying that these tables mean something more than, or something different from, that which they really mean. A table of prices, for example, seems an easy and

simple thing to understand, and a whole literature of statistics assumes that simplicity; but in fact there are many difficulties. At the outset there is a difference between the men of theory and the men of practice. Theorists take a table of prices as facts settled by unalterable laws; a stockbroker will tell you such prices can be "made." In actual business such is his constant expression. If you ask him what is the price of such a stock, he will say, if it be a stock at all out of the common, "I do not know, sir; I will go on to the market and get them to *make* me a price." And the following passage from the Report of the late Foreign Loans' Committee shows what sort of process "making" a price sometimes is:—

"Immediately," they say, "after the publication of the prospectus"—the case is that of the Honduras Loan—"and before any allotment was made, M. Lefevre authorised extensive purchases and sales of loans on his behalf, brokers were employed by him to deal in the manner best calculated to maintain the price of the stock; the brokers so employed instructed jobbers to purchase the stock when the market required to be strengthened, and to sell it if the market was sufficiently firm. In consequence of the market thus created dealings were carried on to a very large amount. Fifty or a hundred men were in the market dealing with each other and the brokers all round. One jobber had sold the loan (£2,500,000) once over."

Much money was thus abstracted from credulous rural investors; and I regret to say that book statisticians are often equally, though less hurtfully, deceived. They make tables in which artificial tables run side by side with natural ones; in which the price of an article like Honduras scrip, which can be indefinitely manipulated, is treated just like the price of Consols, which can scarcely be manipulated at all. In most cases it never occurs to the maker of the table that there could be such a thing as an artificial—a *malâ fide*—price at all. He imagines all prices to be equally straightforward.—Perhaps, however, this may be said to be an unfair sample of price difficulties, because it is drawn from the Stock Exchange, the most complex market for prices;—and no doubt the Stock Exchange has its peculiar difficulties, of which I certainly shall not speak lightly;—but on the other hand, in one cardinal respect, it is the simplest of markets. There is no question in it of the physical quality of commodities: one Turkish bond of 1858 is as good or bad as another; one ordinary share in a railway exactly the same as any other ordinary share; but in other markets each sample differs in quality, and it is a learning in each market to judge of qualities, so many are they, and so fine their gradations. Yet mere tables do not tell this, and cannot tell it. Accordingly in a hundred cases you may see "prices" compared as if they were prices the same thing, when in fact they are prices of different things. The *Gazette* average of corn is thus compared incessantly, yet it is hardly the price of the same exact quality of corn in any two years.

It is an average of all the prices in all the sales in all the markets. But this year the kind of corn mostly sold may be very superior, and last year very inferior—yet the tables compare the two without noticing the difficulty. And when the range of prices runs over many years, the figures are even more treacherous, for the names remain, while the quality, the thing signified, is changed. And of this persons not engaged in business have no warning. Statistical tables, even those which are most elaborate and careful, are not substitutes for an actual cognizance of the facts: they do not, as a rule, convey a just idea of the movements of a trade to persons not *in* the trade.

It will be asked, why do you frame such a science if from its nature it is so difficult to frame it? The answer is that it is necessary to frame it, or we must go without important knowledge. The facts of commerce, especially of the great commerce, are very complex. Some of the most important are not on the surface; some of those most likely to confuse *are* on the surface. If you attempt to solve such problems without some apparatus of method, you are as sure to fail as if you try to take a modern military fortress—a Metz or a Belfort—by common assault; you must have guns to attack the one, and method to attack the other.

The way to be sure of this is to take a few new problems, such as are for ever presented by investigation and life, and to see what by mere common sense we can make of them. For example, it is said that the general productiveness of the earth is less or more in certain regular cycles, corresponding with perceived changes in the state of the sun,—what would be the effect of this cyclical variation in the efficiency of industry upon commerce? Some hold, and as I think hold justly, that, extraordinary as it may seem, these regular changes in the sun have much to do with the regular recurrence of difficult times in the money market. What common sense would be able to answer these questions? Yet we may be sure that if there be a periodical series of changes in the yielding power of this planet, that series will have many consequences on the industry of men, whether those which have been suggested or others.

Or to take an easier case, who can tell without instruction what is likely to be the effect of the new loans of England to foreign nations? We press upon half-finished and half-civilised communities incalculable sums; we are to them what the London money-dealers are to students at Oxford and Cambridge. We enable these communities to read in every newspaper that they can have ready money, almost of any amount, on “personal security.” No incipient and no arrested civilizations ever had this facility before. What will be the effect on such civilizations now, no untutored mind can say.

Or again: since the Franco-German War an immense sum of new money has come to England; England has become the settling-place of international bargains much more than it was before; but whose mind could divine the effect of such a change as this, except it had a professed science to help it?

There are indeed two suggested modes of investigation, besides our English Political Economy, and competing with it. One is the Enumerative, or, if I may coin such a word, the "All-case method." One school of theorists say, or assume oftener than they say, that you should have a "complete experience;" that you should accumulate all the facts of these subjects before you begin to reason. A very able German writer has said, in this very Review,¹ of a great economical topic, banking,—

"I venture to suggest that there is but one way of arriving at such knowledge and truth" (that is absolute truth and full knowledge). "namely, a thorough investigation of the facts of the case. By the facts, I mean not merely such facts as present themselves to so-called practical men in the common routine of business, but the facts which a complete historical and statistical inquiry would develop. When such a work shall have been accomplished, German economists may boast of having restored the principles of banking, that is to say, of German banking, but not even then of banking in general. To set forth principles of banking in general, it will be necessary to master in the same way the facts of English, Scotch, French, and American banking, in short, every country where banking exists. The only" he afterwards continues, "but let us add also, the safe ground of hope for political economy is, following Bacon's exhortation to recommence afresh the whole work of economic inquiry. In what condition would chemistry, physics, geology, zoology be, and the other branches of natural science which have yielded such prodigious results, if their students had been linked to their chains of deduction from the assumptions and speculations of the last century."

But the reply is that the method which Mr. Cohn suggests was tried in physical science and failed. And it is very remarkable that he should not have remembered it as he speaks of Lord Bacon, for the method which he suggests is exactly that which Lord Bacon himself followed, and owing to the mistaken nature of which he discovered nothing. The investigation into the nature of heat in the *Novum Organum* is exactly such a collection of facts as Mr. Cohn suggests,—but nothing comes of it. As Mr. Jevons well says, "Lord Bacon's notion of scientific method was that of a kind of scientific book-keeping. Facts were to be indiscriminately gathered from every source, and posted in a kind of ledger from which would emerge in time a clear balance of truth. It is difficult to imagine a less likely way of arriving at discoveries." And yet it is precisely that from which, mentioning Bacon's name, but not forewarned by his experience, Mr. Cohn hopes to make them.

The real plan that has answered in physical science is much simpler. The discovery of a law of nature is very like the discovery

(1) *Fortnightly Review* for September, 1873.

of a murder. In the one case you arrest a suspected person, and in the other you isolate a suspected cause. When Newton, by the fall of the apple, or something else, was led to think that the attraction of gravitation would account for the planetary motions, he took that cause by itself, traced out its effects by abstract mathematics, and so to say found it "guilty,"—he discovered that it would produce the phenomenon under investigation. In the same way Geology has been revolutionized in our own time by Sir Charles Lyell. He for the first time considered the effects of one particular set of causes by themselves. He showed how large a body of facts could be explained on the hypothesis "that the forces now operating upon and beneath the earth's surface are the same both in kind and degree as those which, at remote epochs, have worked out geological changes." He did not wait to begin his inquiry till his data about all kinds of strata, or even about any particular kind, were complete; he took palpable causes as he knew them, and showed how many facts they would explain; he spent a long and most important life in fitting new facts into an abstract and youthful speculation. Just so in an instance which has made a literature and gone the round of the world. Mr. Darwin, who is a disciple of Lyell, has shown how one *vera causa*, "natural selection," would account for an immense number of the facts of nature; for how many, no doubt, is controverted, but, as is admitted, for a very large number. And this he showed by very difficult pieces of reasoning which very few persons would have thought of, and which most people found at first not at all easy to comprehend. The process by which physical science has become what it is, has not been that of discarding abstract speculations, but of working out abstract speculations. The most important known laws of nature—the laws of motion—the basis of the figures in the Nautical Almanack by which every ship sails,—are difficult and abstract enough, as most of us found to our cost in our youth.

There is no doubt a strong tendency to revolt against abstract reasoning. Human nature has a strong "factish" element in it. The reasonings of the *Principia* are now accepted. But in the beginning they were "mere crotchets of Mr. Newton's;" Flamsteed, the greatest astronomical discoverer of his day—the man of facts, *par excellence*—so called them; they have irresistibly conquered, but at first even those most conversant with the matter did not believe them.—I do not claim for the conclusions of English Political Economy the same certainty as for the "laws of motion." But I say that the method by which they have been obtained is the same, and that the difference in the success of the two investigations largely comes from this—that the laws of wealth are the laws of a most complex phenomenon which you can but passively observe, and

on which you cannot try experiments for science' sake, and that the laws of motion relate to a matter on which you can experiment, and which is comparatively simple in itself.

And to carry the war into the enemy's country, I say also that the method proposed by Mr. Cohn, the "all case" method, is impossible. When I read the words "all the facts of English banking," I cannot but ask of what facts is Mr. Cohn thinking. Banking in England goes on growing, multiplying, and changing, as the English people itself goes on growing, multiplying, and changing. The facts of it are one thing to-day and another to-morrow; nor at any one moment does any one know them completely. Those who best know many of them will not tell them or hint at them; gradually and in the course of years they separately come to light, and by the time they do so, for the most part, another crop of unknown ones has accumulated. If we wait to reason till the "facts" are complete, we shall wait till the human race has expired. I think that Mr. Cohn and those that think with him are too "bookish" in this matter. They mean by having all the "facts" before them, having all the printed facts, all the statistical tables. But what has been said of Nature is true of Commerce. "Nature," says Sir Charles Lyell, "has made it no part of her concern to provide a record of her operations for the use of men;" nor does trade either—only the smallest of fractions of actual transactions is set down, so that investigation can use it. Literature has been called the "fragment of fragments," and in the same way statistics are the "scrap of scraps." In real life scarcely any one knows more than a small part of what his neighbour is doing, and he scarcely makes public any of that little, or of what he does himself. A complete record of commercial facts, or even of one kind of such facts, is the completest of dreams. You might as well hope for an entire record of human conversation.

There is also a second antagonistic method to that of English Political Economy, which, by contrast, I will call the "single case" method. It is said that you should analyse each group of facts separately—that you should take the panic of 1866 separately, and explain it; or, at any rate, the whole history of Lombard Street separately, and explain it. And this is very good and very important; but it is no substitute for a preliminary theory. You might as well try to substitute a corollary for the proposition on which it depends. The history of a panic is the history of a confused conflict of many causes; and unless you know what sort of effect each cause is likely to produce, you cannot explain any part of what happens. It is trying to explain the bursting of a boiler without knowing the theory of steam. Any history of similar phenomena like that of Lombard Street could not be usefully told, unless there was a

considerable accumulation of applicable doctrine before existing. You might as well try to write the "life" of a ship, making as you went along the theory of naval construction. Clumsy dissertations would run all over the narrative; and the result would be a perfect puzzle.

I have been careful not to use in this discussion of methods the phrase which is oftenest used, viz. the Historical method, because there is an excessive ambiguity in it. Sometimes it seems what I have called the Enumerative, or "all case" method; sometimes the "single case" method; a most confusing double meaning, for by the mixture of the two, the mind is prevented from seeing the defects of either. And sometimes it has other meanings, with which, as I shall show, I have no quarrel, but rather much sympathy. Rightly conceived, the Historical method is no rival to the abstract method rightly conceived. But I shall be able to explain this better and less tediously at the end of these papers than I can at the beginning.

This conclusion is confirmed by a curious circumstance. At the very moment that our Political Economy is objected to in some quarters as too abstract, in others an attempt is made to substitute for it one which is more abstract still. Mr. Jevons of Manchester, and M. Walras of Lausanne, without communication, and almost simultaneously, have worked out a "mathematical" theory of Political Economy;—and any one who thinks what is ordinarily taught in England objectionable, because it is too little concrete in its method, and looks too unlike life and business, had better try the new doctrine, which he will find to be much worse on these points than the old.

But I shall be asked, Do you then say that English Political Economy is perfect?—surely it is contrary to reason that so much difficulty should be felt in accepting a real science properly treated? At the first beginning no doubt there are difficulties in gaining a hearing for all sciences, but English Political Economy has long passed out of its first beginning? Surely, if there were not some intrinsic defect, it would have been firmly and coherently established, just as others are?

In this reasoning there is evident plausibility, and I answer that, in my judgment, there are three defects in the mode in which Political Economy has been treated in England, which have prevented people from seeing what it really is, and from prizing it at its proper value.

First. It has often been put forward, not as a theory of the principal causes affecting wealth in *certain* societies, but as a theory of the principal, sometimes even of all, the causes affecting wealth in *every* society. And this has occasioned many and strong doubts about it. Travellers fresh from the sight, and historians fresh from the study of peculiar and various states of society, look with dislike and disbelief

on a single set of abstract propositions which claims, as they think, to be applicable to all such societies, and to explain a most important part of most of them. I cannot here pause to say how far particular English economists have justified this accusation; I only say that, taking the whole body of them, there is much ground for it, and that in almost every one of them there is some ground. No doubt almost every one—every one of importance—has admitted that there is a “friction” in society which counteracts the effect of the causes they treat of. But in general they leave their readers with the idea that, after all, this friction is but subordinate; that probably in the course of years it may be neglected; and, at any rate, the causes assigned in the science of Political Economy, as they treat it, are the main and principal ones. Now I hold that these causes are only the main ones in a single kind of society—a society of grown-up competitive commerce, such as we have in England; that it is only in such societies that the other and counteracting forces can be set together under the minor head of “friction;” but that in other societies these other causes—in some cases one, and in some another—are the most effective ones, and that the greatest confusion arises if you try to fit on *un-economical* societies the theories only true of, and only proved as to, *economical* ones. In my judgment, we need not that the authority of our Political Economy should be impugned, but that it should be *minimized*; that we should realise distinctly where it is established and where not; that its sovereignty should be upheld, but its frontiers marked. And until this is done, I am sure that there will remain the same doubt and hesitation in many minds about the science that there is now.

Secondly, I think it in consequence of this defect of conception economists have been far more abstract, and in consequence much more dry, than they need have been. If they had distinctly set before themselves that they were dealing only with the causes of wealth in a single set of societies, they might have effectively pointed their doctrines with facts from those societies. But, so long as the vision of universal theory vaguely floated before them, they shrank from particular illustrations. Real societies are plainly so many and so unlike that an instance from one kind does not show that the same thing exists in other societies—it rather raises in the mind a presumption that it does not exist there; and therefore speculators aiming at an all-embracing doctrine refrain from telling cases, because those cases are apt to work in ways, and to raise up the image not only of the societies in which the tenet illustrated is true, but also of the opposite group in which it is false.

Thirdly, it is also in consequence, as I imagine, of this defective conception of their science, that English Economists have not been as fertile as they should have been in verifying it. They have

been too content to remain in the "abstract," and to shrink from concrete notions, because they could not but feel that much of the most obvious phenomena of many nations did not look much like their abstractions. Whereas in the societies with which the science is really concerned, an almost infinite harvest of verification was close at hand, ready to be gathered in ; and because it has not been used, much confidence in the science has been lost, and it is thought "to be like the stars which give no good light because they are so high."

Of course this reasoning implies that the boundaries of this sort of Political Economy are arbitrary, and might be fixed here or there. But this is already implied when it is said that Political Economy is an abstract science. All abstractions are arbitrary ; they are more or less convenient fictions made by the mind for its own purposes. An abstract idea means a concrete fact or set of facts *minus* something thrown away. The fact or set of facts were made by nature ; but how much you will throw aside of them and how much you will keep for consideration you settle for yourself. There may be any number of political economies according as the subject is divided off in one way or in another, and in this way all may be useful if they do not interfere with one another or attempt to rule further than they are proved. .

The particular political economy which I have been calling the English Political Economy, is that of which the first beginning was made by Adam Smith. But what he did was much like the rough view of the first traveller who discovers a country ; he saw some great outlines well, but he mistook others and left out much. It was Ricardo who made the first map ; who reduced the subjects into consecutive shape, and constructed what you can call a science. Few greater efforts of mind have been made, and not many have had greater fruits. From Ricardo the science passed to a whole set of minds—James Mill, Senior, Torrens, Macculloch, and others, who busied themselves with working out his ideas, with elaborating and with completing them. For five-and-twenty years the English world was full of such discussions. Then Mr. J. S. Mill—the Mr. Mill whom the present generation know so well, and who has had so much influence,—shaped with masterly literary skill the confused substance of those discussions into a compact whole. He did not add a great deal which was his own, and some of what is due to him does not seem to me of great value. But he pieced the subjects together, showed where what one of his predecessors had done had fitted on to that of another, and adjusted this science to other sciences according to the notions of that time. To many students his book is the Alpha and Omega of Political Economy ; they know little of what was before, and imagine little which can come after in the way of improvement. But it is not given to any writer to occupy such a place. Mr. Mill would

have been the last to claim it for himself. He well knew that taking his own treatise as the standard, what he added to Political Economy was not a ninth of what was due to Ricardo, and that for much of what is new in his book he was rather the *Secrétaire de la Rédaction*; expressing and formulating the current views of a certain world, than producing by original thought from his own brain. And his remoteness from mercantile life, and I should say his enthusiastic character, eager after things far less sublunary than money, made him little likely to give finishing touches to a theory of "the great commerce." In fact he has not done so; much yet remains to be done in it as in all sciences. Mr. Mill, too, seems to me open to the charge of having widened the old Political Economy either too much or not enough. If it be, as I hold, a theory proved of and applicable to particular societies only, much of what is contained in Mr. Mill's book should not be there; if it is, on the contrary, a theory holding good for all societies, as far as they are concerned with wealth, much more ought to be there, and much which is should be guarded and limited. English Political Economy is not a finished and completed theory, but the first lines of a great analysis which has worked out much, but which still leaves much unsettled and unexplained.

There is nothing capricious, we should observe, in this conception of Political Economy, nor though it originated in England is there anything specially English in it. It is the theory of commerce, as commerce tends more and more to be when capital increases and competition grows. England was the first—or one of the first—countries to display these characteristics in such vigour and so isolated as to suggest a separate analysis of them, but as the world goes on, similar characteristics are being evolved in one society after another. A similar money-market, a similar competing trade based on large capital, gradually tends to arise in all countries. As "men of the world" are the same everywhere, so the great commerce is the same everywhere. Local peculiarities and ancient modifying circumstances fall away in both cases; and it is of this one and uniform commerce which grows daily, and which will grow, according to every probability, more and more, that English Political Economy aspires to be the explanation.

And our Political Economy does not profess to prove this growing world to be a good world—far less to be the best. Abroad the necessity of contesting socialism has made some writers use the conclusions brought out by our English science for that object. But the aim of that science is far more humble; it says these and these forces produce these and these effects, and there it stops. It does not profess to give a moral judgment on either; it leaves it for a higher science, and one yet more difficult, to pronounce what ought and what ought not to be.

The first thing to be done for English Political Economy, as I hold, is to put its aim right. So long as writers on it do not clearly see, and as readers do not at all see, the limits of what they are analysing, the result will not satisfy either. The science will continue to seem what to many minds it seems now, proved 'perhaps but proved *in nubibus* ; true, no doubt, somehow and somewhere, but' that somewhere a *terra incognita*, and that somehow an unknown quantity.—As a help in this matter I propose in the present series of papers to take the principal assumptions of Political Economy one by one, and to show, not exhaustively, for that would require a long work, but roughly, where each is true and where it is not. We shall then find that our Political Economy is not a questionable thing of unlimited extent, but a most certain and useful thing of limited extent. By marking the frontier of our property we shall learn its use, and we shall have a positive and reliable basis for estimating its value.

11.

The first assumption which I shall take is that which is perhaps oftener made in our economical reasonings than any other, namely, that labour (masculine labour, I mean) and capital circulate readily within the limits of a nation from employment to employment, leaving that in which the remuneration is smaller and going to that in which it is greater. No assumption can be better founded, as respects such a country as England, in such an economical state as our present one. A rise in the profits of capital, in any trade, brings more capital to it with us nowadays—I do not say quickly, for that would be too feeble a word, but almost instantaneously. If owing to a high price of corn, the corn trade on a sudden becomes more profitable than usual, the bill-cases of bill-brokers and bankers are in a few days stuffed with corn bills—that is to say the free capital of the country is by the lending capitalists, the bankers and bill-brokers, transmitted where it is most wanted. When the price of coal and iron rose rapidly a year or two since, so much capital was found to open new mines and to erect new furnaces that the profits of the coal and iron trades have not yet recovered it. In this case the influence of capital attracted by high profits was not only adequate, but much more than adequate: instead of reducing these profits only to an average level, it reduced them below that level; and this happens most commonly, for the speculative enterprise which brings in the new capital is a strong, eager, and rushing force, and rarely stops exactly where it should. Here and now a craving for capital in a trade is as almost sure to be followed by a plethora of it as winter to be followed by summer.—Labour does

not flow so quickly from pursuit to pursuit, for man is not so easily moved as money—but still it moves very quickly. Patent statistical facts show what we may call “the tides” of our people. Between the years shown by the last census, the years 1861 and 1871, the population of

The Northern counties	increased	23	per cent.
Yorkshire	„	19	„
North-western counties	„	15	„
London	„	16	„

While that of

The South-western counties	only increased	2	per cent.
Eastern	„	7	„
North Midland	„	9	„

—though the fertility of marriages is equal. The set of labour is steadily and rapidly from the counties where there is only agriculture and little to be made of new labour, towards those where there are many employments and where much is to be made of it.

No doubt there are, even at present in England, many limitations to this tendency, both of capital and of labour, which are of various degrees of importance, and which need to be considered for various purposes. There is a “friction,” but still it is only a “friction;” its resisting power is mostly defeated, and at a first view need not be regarded. But taking the world, present and past, as a whole, the exact contrary is true; in most ages and countries this tendency has been not victorious but defeated; in some cases it can scarcely be said even to have existed, much less to have conquered. If you take at random a country in history, the immense chances are that you will find this tendency either to be altogether coerced, or not at all to prevail as it does with us now. This primary assumption of our Political Economy is not true everywhere and always, but only in a few places and a few times.

The truth of it depends on the existence of conditions which, taken together, are rarely satisfied. Let us take labour first, as it is the oldest and simplest of the two. First there must be “employments” between which labour is to migrate; and this is not true at all of the primitive states of society. We are used to a society which abounds in felt wants that it can satisfy, and where there are settled combinations of men—trades as we call them—each solely occupied in satisfying some one of them. But in primitive times nothing at all like this exists. The conscious wants of men are few, the means of supplying them still fewer, and the whole society homogeneous—one man living much as another. Civilization is a shifting mixture of many colours, but barbarism was and is of a dull monotony, hardly varying even in shade.

A picture or two of savage tribes brings this home to the mind

better than abstract words. Let us hear Mr. Catlin's description of a favourite North American tribe, with which he means us to be much pleased :—

“The Mandans, like all other tribes, live lives of idleness and leisure, and of course devote a great deal of time to their amusements, of which they have a great variety. Of these dancing is one of the principal, and may be seen in a variety of forms; such as the buffalo dance, the boasting dance, the begging dance, the scalp-dance, and a dozen other dances, all of which have their peculiar characters and meanings and objects.”

Then he describes the “starts and jumps” of these dances, and goes on :—

“Buffaloes, it is well known, are a sort of roaming creatures congregating occasionally in huge masses, and strolling away about the country from east to west or from north to south, or just where their whims or fancies may lead them; and the Mandans are sometimes by this means most unceremoniously left without anything to eat, and being a small tribe and unwilling to risk their lives by going far from home in the face of their more powerful enemies, are oftentimes left almost in a state of starvation. In any emergency of this kind every man musters and brings out of his lodge his mask (the skin of a buffalo's head with the horns on), which he is obliged to keep in readiness for this occasion; and then commences the buffalo dance of which I have spoken, which is held for the purpose of making ‘buffalo come,’ as they term it,—of inducing the buffalo herds to change the direction of their wanderings, and bend their course towards the Mandan village and graze about on the beautiful hills and bluffs in its vicinity, where the Mandans can shoot them down and cook them as they want them for food.

“For the most part of the year the young warriors and hunters by riding out a mile or two from the village can kill meat in abundance; and sometimes large herds of these animals may be seen grazing in full view of the village. There are other seasons also when the young men have ranged about the country, as far as they are willing to risk their lives, on account of their enemies, without finding meat. This sad intelligence is brought back to the chiefs and doctors, who sit in solemn council and consult on the most expedient measures to be taken until they are sure to decide the old and only expedient ‘which has never failed.’ This is the buffalo dance, which is incessantly continued till ‘buffalo come,’ and which the whole village by relays of dancers keeps up in succession. And when the buffaloes are seen, there is a brisk preparation for the chase—a great hunt takes place. The choicest pieces of the carcase are sacrificed to the Great Spirit, and then a surfæit or a carouse. These dances have sometimes been continued for two or three weeks until the joyful moment when buffaloes made their appearance. And so they ‘never fail,’ as the village thinks, to bring the buffaloes in.”

Such is the mode of gaining the main source of existence, without which the tribe would starve. And as to the rest we are told—

“The principal occupations of the women in this village consist in procuring wood and water, in cooking, dressing robes and other skins, in drying meat and wild fruits, and raising maize.”

In this attractive description there is hardly any mention of male labour at all; the men hunt, fight, and amuse themselves, and the women do all the rest.

And in the lowest form of savage life, in the stone age, the social structure must have been still more uniform, for there were still less

means to break or vary it. The number of things which can be made with a flint implement is much greater than one would have imagined, and savages made more things with it than any one would make now. Time is nothing in the savage state, and protracted labour, even with the worst instrument, achieves much, especially when there are no other means of achieving anything. But there is no formal division of employments—no cotton trade, no iron trade, no woollen trade. There are beginnings of a division, of course, but, as a rule, every one does what he can at every thing.

In much later times the same uniformity in the structure of society still continues. We all know from childhood how simple is the constitution of a pastoral society. As we see it in the Pentateuch it consists of one family, or a group of families, possessing flocks and herds, on which, and by which, they live. They have no competing employments; no alternative pursuits. What manufactures there are are domestic, are the work of women at all times, and of men, of certain men, at spare times. No circulation of labour is then conceivable, for there is no circle; there is no group of trades round which to go, for the whole of industry is one trade.

Many agricultural communities are exactly similar. The pastoral communities have left the life of movement, which is essential to a subsistence on flocks and herds, and have fixed themselves on the soil. But they have hardly done more than change one sort of uniformity for another. They have become peasant proprietors—combining into a village, and holding more or less their land in common, but having no pursuit worth mentioning, except tillage. The whole of their industrial energy—domestic clothes-making and similar things excepted—is absorbed in that.

No doubt in happy communities a division of labour very soon and very naturally arises, and at first sight we might expect that with it a circulation of labour would begin too. But an examination of primitive society does not confirm this idea; on the contrary, it shows that a main object of the social organization which then exists, is to impede or prevent that circulation. And upon a little thought the reason is evident. There is no paradox in the notion; early nations were not giving up an advantage which they might have had; the good which we enjoy from the circulation of labour was unattainable by them; all they could do was to provide a substitute for it—a means of enjoying the advantages of the division of labour without it,—and this they did. We must carry back our minds to the circumstances of primitive society before we can comprehend the difficulty under which they laboured, and see how entirely it differs from any which we have to meet now.

A free circulation of labour from employment to employment involves an incessant competition between man and man, which causes constant quarrels,—some of which, as we see in the daily transactions

of trades unions, easily run into violence; and also a constant series of new bargains, one differing from another, some of which are sure to be broken, or said to be so, which makes disputes of another kind. The peace of society is exposed in early times to greater danger from this source than now, because the passions of men were then less under control than now. "In the simple and violent times," as they have been well called, "which we read of in our Bibles," people struck one another, and people killed one another, for very little matters as we should think them. And the most efficient counter-active machinery which now preserves that peace, then did not exist. We have now in the midst of us a formed, elaborate, strong government, which is incessantly laying down the best rules which it can find to prevent trouble under changing circumstances, and which constantly applies a sharp pervading force running through society to prevent and punish breaches of those rules. We are so familiar with the idea of a government inherently possessing and daily exercising both executive and legislative power, that we scarcely comprehend the possibility of a nation existing without them. But if we attend to the vivid picture given in the Book of Judges of an early stage in Hebrew society, we shall see that there was then absolutely no legislative power, and only a faint and intermittent executive power. The idea of law making, the idea of making new rules for new circumstances, would have been as incomprehensible to Gideon or Abimelech as the statutes at large to a child of three years old. They and their contemporaries thought that there was an unalterable law consecrated by religion and confirmed by custom which they had to obey, but they could not have conceived an alteration of it except as an act of wickedness—a worshipping of Baal. And the actual coercive power available for punishing breaches of it was always slight, and often broken. One "judge," or ruler, arises after another, sometimes in one tribe and place, and another in another, and exercises some kind of jurisdiction, but his power is always limited; there is no organization for transmitting it, and often there is no such person—no king in Israel whatever.

The names and the details of this book may or may not be historical, but its spirit is certainly true. The peace of society then reposed on a confused sentiment, in which respect for law, as such—at least law in our usual modern sense—was an inconsiderable element, and of which the main components were a coercive sense of ingrained usage, which kept men from thinking what they had not before thought, and from doing what they had not before done; a vague horror that something, they did not well know what, might happen if they did so; a close religion which filled the air with deities who were known by inherited tradition, and who hated uninherited ways; and a submission to local opinion inevitable when family and tribe were

the, main props of life,—when there really was “no world without Verona’s walls,”—when every exile was an outcast, expelled from what was then most natural, and scarcely finding an alternative existence.

No doubt this sentiment was in all communities partially reinforced by police. Even at the time of the “Judges,” there were no doubt “local authorities,” as we should now say, who forcibly maintained some sort of order even when the central power was weakest. But the main support of these authorities was the established opinion; they had no military to call in, no exterior force to aid them; if the fixed sentiment of the community was not strong enough to aid them they collapsed and failed. But that fixed sentiment would have been at once weakened, if not destroyed, by a free circulation of labour, which is a spring of progress that is favourable to new ideas, that brings in new inventions, that prevents the son being where his father was, that interrupts the tradition of generations and breaks inherited feeling. Besides causing new sorts of quarrels by creating new circumstances and new occasions, this change of men from employment to employment decomposes their moral authority, which alone in this state of society can prevent quarrels or settle them. Accordingly, the most successful early societies have forbidden this ready change as much as possible, and have endeavoured as far as they could to obtain the advantages of the division of labour without it. Sir Henry Maine, to whom this subject so peculiarly belongs, and who has taught us so much more on it than any one else, shall describe the industrial expedients of primitive society as he has seen them still surviving in India:—

“There is,” he says, “yet another feature of the modern Indian cultivating group which connects them with primitive western communities of the same kind. I have several times spoken of them as organized and self-acting. They in fact include a nearly complete establishment of occupations and trades for enabling them to continue their collective life without assistance from any person or body external to them. Besides the headmen or council exercising quasi-judicial, quasi-legislative power, they contain a village police, now recognized and paid in certain provinces by the British Government. They include several families of hereditary traders; the blacksmith, the harness-maker, the shoemaker. The Brahmin is also found for the performance of ceremonies, and even the dancing-girl for attendance at festivities. There is invariably a village accountant, an important person among an unlettered population, so important indeed and so conspicuous, that according to reports current in India, the earliest English functionaries engaged in settlements of land were occasionally led by their assumption that there must be a single proprietor somewhere to mistake the accountant for the owner of the village, and to record him as such in the official register. But the person practising any one of these hereditary employments is really a servant of the community as well as one of its component members. He is sometimes paid by an allowance in grain, more generally by the allotment to his family of a piece of land in hereditary possession. Whatever else he may demand for the wares he produces is limited by a fixed price very rarely departed from.”

To no world could the free circulation of labour, as we have it in England, and as we assume it in our Political Economy, be more alien, and in none would it have been more incomprehensible. In this case as in many others, what seems in later times the most natural organization is really one most difficult to create, and it does not arise till after many organizations which seem to our notions more complex have preceded it and perished. The village association of India, as Sir Henry Maine describes it, seems a much more elaborate structure, a much more involved piece of workmanship, than a common English village where everyone chooses his own calling, and where there are no special rules for each person, and where a single law rules all. But in fact our organization is the more artificial because it presupposes the pervading intervention of an effectual government—the last triumph of civilisation, and one to which early times had nothing comparable. In expecting what we call simple things from early ages, we are in fact expecting them to draw a circle without compasses, to produce the results of civilisation when they have not attained civilisation.

One instance of this want of simplicity in early institutions, which has almost more than any other impaired the free transit of labour, is the complexity of the early forms of landholding. In a future page I hope to say something of the general effects of this complexity, and to compare it with the assumptions as to ownership in land made by Ricardo and others. I am here only concerned with it as affecting the movement of men, but in this respect its effect has been incalculable. As is now generally known, the earliest form of landowning was not individual holding, but tribal owning. In the old contracts of Englishmen with savages nothing was commoner than for the king or chief to sell tracts of land,—and the buyers could not comprehend that according to native notions he had no right to do so, that he could not make a title to it, and that according to those notions there was no one who could. Englishmen in all land dealings looked for some single owner, or at any rate some small number of owners, who had an exceptional right over particular pieces of land; they could not conceive the supposed ownership of a tribe, as in New Zealand, or of a village in India, over large tracts. Yet this joint-stock principle is that which has been by far the commonest in the world, and that which the world began with. And not without good reason. In the early ages of society, it would have been impossible to maintain the exclusive ownership of a few persons in what seems, at first sight, an equal gift to all—a thing to which every one has the same claim. There was then no distinct government apart from and above the tribe any more than among New Zealanders now. There was no compulsory agency which could create or preserve exclusive ownership of the land, even if it had

been wished. And of course it could not have been wished, for though experience has now conclusively shown that such exclusive ownership is desirable for and beneficial to the nation as a whole as well as to the individual owner, no theorist would have been bold enough to predict this beforehand. This monopoly is almost a paradox after experience, and it would have seemed monstrous folly before it. Indeed, the idea of a discussion of it is attributing to people in the year 1000 B.C. the notions of people in the year 1800 A.D. Common ownership was then irremediable and inevitable; no alternative for it was possible, or would then have been conceivable. But it is in its essence opposed to the ready circulation of labour. Few things fix a man so much as a share in a property which is fixed by nature, and common ownership, wherever it prevails, gives the mass of men such a share.

And there is another force of the same tendency which does not act so widely, but which when it does act is even stronger—in many cases is omnipotent. This is the disposition of many societies to crystallize themselves into *specialized groups*, which are definite units, each with a character of its own, and are more or less strictly hereditary. Sir Henry Maine has described to us how in an Indian village the blacksmith is hereditary, and the harness-maker, and the shoe-maker,—and this is natural for every trade has its secrets, which make a kind of craft or “mystery” of it, and which must be learnt by transmission or not at all. The first and most efficient kind of apprenticeship is that by birth; the father teaches his son that by which he makes his living, almost without knowing it; the son picks up the skill which is in the air of the house, almost without feeling that he is doing so. Even now we see that there are city families, and university and legal families,—families where a special kind of taste and knowledge are passed on in each generation by tradition, and which in each have in that respect an advantage over others. In most ages most kinds of skilled labour have shown a disposition to intensify this advantage by combination—to form a bounded and exclusive society, guild, trades union, or whatever it may be called, which keeps or tries to keep in each case to itself the rich secret of the inherited art. And even when no pains are taken, each special occupation, after it gains a certain size, tends to form itself into a separate group. Each occupation has certain peculiar characteristics which help to success in it, and which, therefore, it fosters and develops; and in a subtle way these traits collect together and form a group-character analogous to a national character. The process of caste-making is often thought to be an old-world thing which came to an end when certain old castes were made and fixed before the dawn of history. But in fact the process has been actively at work in recent times, and has hardly yet died

out. Thus in Cashmere, where the division of castes is already minute, Mr. Drew tells us that of the Batals—a class at the very bottom of the scale, “whose trade it is to remove and skin carcasses, and to cure leather,”—he has heard “that there are two classes; so apt are communities in India to divide and to subdivide, to perpetuate differences, and to separate rather than amalgamate. The higher Batals follow the Mohammedan rules as to eating, and are allowed some fellowship with the other Mohammedans. The lower Batals eat carrion, and would not bear the name of Mohammedans in the mouths of others, though they might call themselves so.” Just so, Mr. Hunter says that “the Brahmins of Lower Bengal bore to the Brahmins of Oudh the same relation that the landed gentry of Canada or Australia bears to the landed gentry of England. Each is an aristocracy, both claim the title of Esquire, but each is composed of elements whose social history is widely different, and the home aristocracy never regards the successful settlers as equal in rank. The Brahmins of the middle land went further; they declared the Brahmins of Lower Bengal inferior, not only in the social scale, but in religious capabilities. To this day many of the north country Brahmins do not eat with the Brahmins of the lower valley, and convicted felons from the north-west will suffer repeated floggings in jail for contumacy, rather than let rice cooked by a Bengal Brahmin pass their lips.” Caste-making is not a rare act, but a constantly occurring act, when circumstances aid it, and when the human mind is predisposed to it.

One great aid to this process is the mutual animosity of the different groups. “What one nation hates,” said Napoleon, “is another nation;” just so, what one caste hates is another caste: the marked characteristics of each being different form a certain natural basis for mutual dislike. There is an intense disposition in the human mind—as you may see in any set of schoolboys—to hate what is unusual and strange in other people, and each caste supplies those adjoining it with a conspicuous supply of what is unusual. And this hatred again makes each caste more and more unlike the other, for every one wishes as much as possible to distinguish himself from the neighbouring hated castes by excelling in the peculiarities of his own caste, and by avoiding theirs.

In the ancient parts of the world these contrasts of group to group are more or less connected for the most part with contrasts of race. Very often the origin of the caste—the mental tendency which made its first members take to its special occupation—was some inborn peculiarity of race; and at other times, as successive waves of conquest passed over the country, each race of conquerors connected themselves most with, and at last fell into, the pre-existing kind of persons which they most resembled, and frequently

in so doing hardened into an absolute caste what was before a half-joined and incipient group.

Each conquest, too, tends to make a set of outcasts—generally from the worst part of the previous population—and these become “hewers of wood and drawers of water” to the conquerors; that is, they are an outlying and degraded race, which is not admitted to compete or mix with the others, and which becomes more degraded from feeling that it is thus inferior, and from being confined to the harder, baser, and less teaching occupations. And upon these unhappy groups the contempt and hatred of the higher ones tend to concentrate themselves, and, like most strong sentiments in the early world, they find for themselves a religious sanction. To many villages in India, Sir Henry Maine says, there are attached a class of “outsiders” who never enter the village, or only enter reserved portions of it, who are looked on as “essentially impure,” “whose very touch is avoided as contaminating.” These poor people are more or less thought to be “accursed;” to have some taint which shows that the gods hate them, and which justifies men in hating them too, and in refusing to mix with them.

The result of these causes is, that many ancient societies are complex pieces of patchwork—bits of contrasted human nature, put side by side. They have a variegated complexity, which modern civilised States mostly want. And there must clearly have been an advantage in this organization of labour—to speak of it in modern phrase—though it seems to us now so strange, or it would not have sprung up independently in many places and many ages, and have endured in many for long tracts of years. This advantage, as we have seen, was the gain of the division of labour without the competition which with us accompanies it, but which the structure of society was not then hard enough to bear.

No doubt we must not push too far this notion of the rigidity of caste. The system was too rigid to work without some safety-valves, and in every age and place where that system prevails, some have been provided. Thus in India we are told “a Brahmana unable to subsist by his duties may live by the duty of a soldier; if he cannot get a subsistence by either of these employments, he may apply to tillage and attendance on cattle, or gain a competence by traffic, avoiding certain commodities. A Ghatriya in distress may subsist by all these means, but he must not have recourse to the highest functions. A Vaisya unable to subsist by his own duties may descend to the servile acts of a Sudra; and a Sudra, not finding employment by waiting on men of the higher classes, may subsist by handicrafts; besides the particular occupations assigned to the mixed classes, they have the alternative of following that profession which regularly

belongs to the class from which they derive their origin on the mother's side;" and so on, without end.

And probably it is through these supplementary provisions, as I may call them, that the system of caste ultimately breaks down and disappears. It certainly disappeared in ancient Egypt when the compact Roman Government was strong enough to do without it, and when a change of religion had removed the sanctions which fixed and consecrated it. The process is most slow, as our experience in India proves. The saying that "*La providence a ses aises dans le temps*" has rarely elsewhere seemed so true. Still, the course is sure, and the caste system will in the end pass away, whenever an efficient substitute has been made for it, and the peace of industry secured without it.

But it would be a great mistake to believe that, whenever and wherever there is an efficient external government capable of enforcing the law, and of making the competitive migration of labour safe and possible, such migration of itself at once begins. There is in most cases a long and dreary economical interval to be passed first. In many countries, the beginning of such migration is for ages retarded by the want of another requisite—the want of external security. We have come in modern Europe to look on nations as if they were things indestructible—at least, on large nations. But this is a new idea, and even now it has to be taken with many qualifications. But in many periods of history it has not been true at all; the world was in such confusion, that it was almost an even chance whether nations should continue, or whether they should be conquered and destroyed. In such times the whole energy of the community must be concentrated on its own defence; all that interferes with it must be sacrificed, if it is to live. And the most efficient mode of defending it mostly is a feudal system; that is, a local militia based on the land, where each occupier of the soil has certain services to render, of which he cannot divest himself, and which he must stay on certain definite fields to perform when wanted. In consequence the races of men which were possessed of an organization easily adapting itself to the creation of such a militia, have had a striking tendency to prevail in the struggle of history. "The feudal system," says Sir George Campbell, on many accounts one of our most competent judges, "I believe to be no invention of the Middle Ages, but the almost necessary result of the hereditary character of the Indo-Germanic institutions, when the tribes take the position of dominant conquerors. They form in fact an hereditary army, with that gradation of fealty from the commander to the private soldier which is essential in military operations. Accordingly, we find that among all the tribes of Indo-Germanic blood which have conquered and ruled Indian provinces, the tendency is to establish a

feudal system extremely similar to that which prevailed in Europe. In Rajpootana the system is still in full force. The Mahrattas and Sikhs had both established a similar system. In my early days it existed in great perfection in some parts of the Bis-Sutlej States." And where the system is most developed, at the lowest point of the scale there is always an immovable class—serfs, *villains regardant*, or what we choose to call them—who do not fight themselves, who perhaps are too abject in spirit, or perhaps are of too dubious fidelity to be let have arms, but who cultivate the ground for those who really fight. The soldier class, rooted to the land by martial tenure, has beneath it a non-soldier class even more rooted to the soil by the tenure of tilling it. I need not say how completely such a system of military defence, and such a system of cultivation, are opposed to the free transit of labour from employment to employment. Where these systems are perfectly developed, this transit is not so much impeded as prevented.

And there is a yet more pervading enemy of the free circulation of labour. This is slavery. We must remember that our modern notion that slavery is an exceptional institution, is itself an exceptional idea; it is the product of recent times and recent philosophies. No ancient philosopher, no primitive community, would have comprehended what we meant by it. That human beings are divided into strong and weak, higher and lower, or what is thought to be such; and that the weak and inferior ought to be made to serve the higher and better, whether they would wish to do so or not, are settled axioms of early thought. Whatever might be the origin and whatever might be the fate of other institutions, the ancient world did not doubt that slavery at all events existed "by the law of nature," and would last as long as men. And it interferes with the ready passage of labour from employment to employment in two ways. First it prevents what we call for this purpose "employments"—that is, markets where labour may be bought, mostly in order that the produce may be sold. Slavery on the contrary strengthens and extends domestic manufactures where the produce is never sold at all, where it is never intended to be so, but where each household by its own hands makes what it wants. In a slave-community so framed, not only is there little quick migration of free labour, but there are few fit places for it to migrate between; there are no centres for the purchase of much of it; society tends to be divided into self-sufficing groups, buying little from the exterior. And at a later stage of industrial progress slavery arrests the movement of free labour still more effectively by providing a substitute. It is then the slave labour which changes occupation, and not the free labour. Just as in the present day a capitalist who wants to execute any sort of work hires voluntary labour to do it, so

in a former stage of progress he would buy slaves in order to do it. He might not indeed be able to buy enough slaves—enough suitable slaves, that is, for his purpose. The organization of slavery has never been as effectual as our present classified system of free labour, and from intrinsic defects never can be. But it does develop earlier. Just when the system of free labour might develop if it were let alone, the imperfect substitute of slavery steps in and spoils it. When free labour still moves slowly and irregularly, and when frequent wars supply the slave-market with many prisoners, the slave-market is much the easiest resource of the capitalist. So it is when a good slave-trade keeps it well filled. The capitalist finds it better to buy than to hire, for there are in this condition of things comparatively many men to be bought and comparatively few to be hired. And the result takes unexpected directions. “What the printing-press is in modern times,” says a German writer, “that slavery was in ancient times.” And though this may be a little exaggerated, it is certain that in ancient Rome books were produced much cheaper and in much greater number than they were for hundreds of years afterwards. When there was a demand for a book, extra copying-slaves could be “turned on” to multiply it in a way which in later times, when slavery had ceased, was impossible, and which is only surpassed by the way in which additional compositors are applied to works in demand now. And political philosophers proposed to obtain revenue from this source, and to save taxation. “Suppose,” says Xenophon, “that the Athenian State should buy twelve thousand slaves, and should let them out to work in the mines at an obolus a head, and suppose that the whole amount annually thus received should be employed in the purchase of new slaves, who should again in the same way yield the same income, and so on successively; the state would then by these means in five or six years possess six thousand slaves,” which would yield a large income. The idea of a compound interest investment in men, though abhorrent to us, seemed most natural to Xenophon. And almost every page of the classics proves how completely the civilisation then existing was based on slavery in one or other of its forms—that of skilled labour (the father of Demosthenes owned thirty-three cutlers and twenty coachmakers) or unskilled, that might either be worked by the proprietor or let out, as he liked. Even if this system had only economical consequences, it must have prevented the beginning of freely moving labour, for it is much handier than such a system can be at its outset. And as we know, the system has moral effects working in the same way even more powerful, for it degrades labour by making it the slave-mark, and makes the free labourer—whether the *prolétaire* of

ancient cities, or the "mean white" of American plantations—one of the least respectable and the least workmanlike of mankind.

Happily this full-grown form of slavery is exceedingly frail. We have ourselves seen in America how completely it collapses at an extrinsic attack; how easy it is to destroy it, how impossible to revive it. And much of the weakness of ancient civilisation was also so caused. Any system which makes the mass of a society hate the constitution of that society, must be in unstable equilibrium. A small touch will overthrow it, and scarcely any human power will reestablish it. And this is the necessary effect of capitalistic slavery, for it prevents all other labourers, makes slaves the "many" of the community, and fills their minds with grief and hatred. Capitalistic slavery is, as history shows, one of the easiest things to efface, as domestic slavery is one of the hardest. But capitalistic slavery has vitally influenced most of the greatest civilisations; and as domestic slavery has influenced nearly all of them, the entire effect of the two has been prodigious.

We see then that there are at least four conditions to be satisfied before this axiom of our English Political Economy is true within a nation. Before labour can move easily and as it pleases from employment to employment there must be such employments for it to move between;—there must be an effectual Government capable of maintaining peace and order during the transition and not requiring itself to be supported by fixity of station in society as so many governments have been;—the nation must be capable of maintaining its independent existence against other nations without a military system dependent on localised and immovable persons; and there must be no competing system of involuntary labour limiting the number of employments or moving between them more perfectly than contemporary free labour. These are not indeed all the conditions needful for the truth of the axiom, but the others can be explained better when some other matters have been first discussed.

WALTER BAGEHOT.

MODERN ENGLISH PROSE.

IN comparing for purposes of study the two great Histories of Greece which England produced in the last generation, a thought, which has most probably often presented itself to other students, has frequently occurred to me. Much as the two works differ in plan, in views, and in manner of execution, their difference has never struck me so much as in the point of style. And the remarkable feature of this difference is, that it is not by any means the natural variation which we allow for, and indeed expect, in the productions of any two men of decided and distinct literary ability. It is not as the difference between Hume and Gibbon, and the difference between Clarendon and Taylor. In the styles of these great writers, and in those of many others, there is the utmost conceivable diversity; but at the same time they are all styles. We can see (see it, indeed, so clearly that we hardly take the trouble to think about it) that each of them made a distinct effort to arrange his words into their clause, his clauses into their sentence, and his sentences into their paragraph according to certain forms, and that though these forms varied in the subtle and indescribable measure of the taste and idiosyncrasy of each writer, the effort was always present, and was only accidentally if inseparably connected with the intention to express certain thoughts, to describe certain facts, or to present certain characters. But when we come to compare Thirlwall with Grote, we find not a variation of the kind just mentioned, but the full opposition of the presence of style on the one hand and the absence of it on the other. The late Bishop of St. David's will probably never be cited among the greatest masters of English prose style, but still we can see without difficulty that he has inherited its traditions. It would be difficult, on the other hand, to persuade a careful critic that Grote ever thought of such things as the cadence of a sentence or the composition of a paragraph. That he took so much trouble as might suffice to make his meaning clear and his language energetic is obvious; that in no case did he think of looking beyond this is I think certain.

But the difference between these two great historians is very far from being a mere isolated fact, of little more interest or significance than a parallel between Macedon and Monmouth. It marks with extraordinary precision the date and nature of a change which has affected English literature to a degree and in a manner worthy of the most serious consideration. What this change is, and whether it amounts to an actual decay or to a mere temporary neglect of style in English prose writing, are questions which are certainly of importance, and the answers to which should not, as it seems to me, lack interest.

If, then, we take up almost any book of the last century, we shall find that within varying limits the effort of which I have just spoken is distinctly present. The model upon which the writer frames his style may be and probably is faulty in itself, and still more probably is faultily copied; there may be too much Addison in the mixture, or too much Johnson; but still we shall see that an honest attempt at style, an honest endeavour at manner as apart from matter, has been made, however clumsy the attempt may be, and however short of success it may fall. But if we take up any book of the last forty or fifty years, save a very few, the first thing that will strike us is the total absence of any attempt or endeavour of the kind. The matter will, as a rule, have been more or less carefully attended to, and will be presented to the reader with varying degrees of clearness and precision. But the manner, except in so far as certain peculiarities of manner may be conducive or prejudicial to clearness and precision of statement—sometimes perhaps to apparent precision with any sacrifice of clearness—will in most cases be found to have been totally neglected, if a thing may be said to be neglected which does not appear to have even presented itself within the circumference of the field of view. In other words, and to adopt a convenient distinction, though there may be a difference of manner, there is usually no difference of style, for there is no style at all.

Before going any further, it may be well to adopt a commendable, if antiquated and scholastic practice, and to set down accurately what is here meant by style, and of what it consists. Style is the choice and arrangement of language with only a subordinate regard to the meaning to be conveyed. Its parts are the choice of the actual words to be used, the further selection and juxtaposition of these words, the structure of the clauses into which they are wrought, the arrangement of the clauses into sentences, and the composition of the sentences into paragraphs. Beyond the paragraph style can hardly be said to go, but within that limit it is supreme. The faults incident to these parts (if I may be allowed still to be scholastic) are perhaps also worthy of notice. Every one can see, though every one is by no means careful to put his knowledge into practice, that certain words are bad of themselves, and certain others to be avoided wherever possible. The mere grammar of style teaches us not to say "commence" where we can say "begin," or "reliable" where we can say "trustworthy." The next stage introduces difficulties of a higher order, though these also are more or less elementary. Most people can see the faults in the following sentences:—

"Had he always written upon the level we behold here there could be little question that the author would have taken his place amongst the front rank of dramatists." Here "writing upon the level we behold here" is a combination of the most obviously incon-

gruous notions. Again, "They did reject him *of course*, but 'his speech remains as a model for all true men to follow, as a warning to all who may adopt another *course*,'" &c. Here the unintentional repetition of the word "*course*" in an entirely different sense within the compass of a couple of lines is unpardonable. But these are mere rudiments; it is in the breach or neglect of the rules that govern the structure of clauses, of sentences, and of paragraphs that the real secret of style consists, and to illustrate this breach or observation is less easy. The task will be perhaps made easier if we consider first in the rough how the prevalent English style of the present day differs from that of past times.

Some five-and-thirty years ago De Quincey had already noticed and deplored the deterioration of which we speak. In his *Essay on Style* (reprinted in the sixth volume of his collected works) he undertakes to discuss at some length the symptoms and causes of the disease. De Quincey, as any one who is at all acquainted with his works is aware, gave considerable attention to the subject of style, and professed to be no mean authority thereon. There were, indeed, two peculiarities about him which prevented him from deserving a very high place as a referee on such matters. The first was his mistaken idea that extremely ornate prose—the prose which his ally John Wilson called "*numerous*," and which others have called *Asiatic*—was the highest form attainable, and that any writer who did not aim at this fell naturally into a lower class. The other was his singular crotchettiness, which made him frequently refuse to see any good in the style of writers to whom, for some reason or for no reason, he had taken a dislike. It will probably be allowed, not merely by persons who hold traditional opinions, but by all independent students of literature, that we must look with considerable distrust on the dicta of a critic who finds fault with the styles of Plato and of Conyers Middleton. The *Essay on Style*, however (at least its first part, for the latter portions go off into endless digressions of no pertinence whatever), is much more carefully written and much more carefully reasoned than most of De Quincey's work. The purport of it is, that the decay of style is to be attributed partly to the influence of German literature, but chiefly to the prevalence of journalism. No one will deny that the influence of newspaper writing is in many ways bad, and that to it is due much of the decadence in style of which complaint is made. But either the prevalent manner of journalism has undergone a remarkable change during the past generation, or else the particular influence which De Quincey supposes it to have had was mistaken by him. I do not myself pretend to a very intimate acquaintance with the periodical literature of thirty or forty years ago, and I am afraid that not even in the pursuit of knowledge could I be tempted to plunge into such a dreary and unbuoyant *mare mortuum*. With respect to the papers

of to-day it is certainly not difficult to discern a peculiarity in their styles, or in what does duty for style in them. A large volume, for instance, might be profitably written, if, perhaps, not so profitably read, on the various stylistic peculiarities of the *Times*. There used to be the famous and memorable affectation of peculiar spelling, or what one might perhaps, after the story of King Sigismund, call the *super-orthographicam* style. Then, some ten years ago, there came the great "Queen of Sheba" style, which consisted in opening an article with some fact or allusion which had the remotest (or not the remotest) connection with the subject. Of late, perhaps, there has been less unity; but one style has never been lacking—a style which might be called the magisterial, but which I (having been once informed by a great master thereof, with whom I presumed to differ, that "all persons of common sense and morality" thought as he did) prefer to call the common-sense-and-morality style. This style is convenient for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness. If you approve, you can point out not too enthusiastically that the view or proceeding in question is the only one which common sense and morality allow; if (which is possible) you do not understand, common sense, by not understanding also, will help you out of the difficulty; and if you disapprove, morality will be as violently outraged as you like. Of the weekly papers, it is impossible not to admire the free-and-easy doctrinaire-ism of the *Spectator*, which is almost entirely an affair of style depending on a sedulous avoidance of ornate language, and a plentiful use of colloquial words and phrases about the least colloquial matters. Then there is the style of the *Saturday Review* in its political articles, a style which appears to be framed on the principle that thoughts and words economise weight by being meted out in small doses, and that a pound of buckshot will go farther than a pound of bullets. Lastly, the inquirer into such things will not neglect the peculiar aridity of certain of the older *Quarterlies*, which seem to have retained the ponderous clauses of other days, while neglecting the form which saved those clauses from being cumbrous. But in most of all this we shall find little to bear out De Quincey's verdict. Long and involved sentences, unduly stuffed with fact and meaning, are what he complains of; and though there is no doubt that we should not have to go far in order to find such at the present day, yet it does not appear, to me at least, that the main fault of contemporary English style is of this kind. On the contrary, the sin of which I should chiefly complain is the sin of over-short sentences, of mere gasps instead of balanced periods. Such a paragraph as the following will illustrate what I mean: "That request was obeyed by the massacre of six out of the surviving princes of the imperial family. Two alone escaped. With such a mingling of light and darkness did Constantine close his

career." I think that any one who considers this combination of two mutilated clauses with an interjectional copula, and who perceives with what ease its hideous cacophony might have been softened into a complete and harmonious sentence, must feel certain that its present form is to some extent intentional. The writer might very well have written: "That request was obeyed by the massacre of six out of the eight surviving princes of the imperial family, and the career of Constantine was closed in a mixture of light and darkness." Why did he not?

Again, let us take a book of recent date, whose style has received considerable praise both in England and abroad—Mr. Green's *Short History of the English People*. The character of Elizabeth is perhaps the most carefully written, certainly the most striking, passage in the book, and contains a most elaborate statement of that view of the great queen which many historical students now take. It enforces this view with the greatest energy, and sets it before us in every detail and difference of light and shade. But how inartistic it is! how thoroughly bad in conception, composition, and style! In the first place it occupies some seven printed pages of unusual extent and closeness, each of which is at least equal to two of the ordinary octavo pages of an English classic author. Let any one, if he can, imagine one of the great masters who could both draw and compose, Hume or Middleton, Clarendon or Swift, giving us a character of fourteen pages. A portrait on the scale of Brobdingnag, with all features and all defects unnaturally emphasized and enlarged, could hardly be more disgusting.¹

It is not necessary to multiply examples, which if all the defects of contemporary style were to be noticed and illustrated, would occupy a space longer than the present article. In all but a very few writers we shall observe with certain variations the same defects—inordinate copiousness of treatment combined with an utter inability, or at best an extreme unwillingness, to frame a sentence of due proportion and careful structure. It should certainly be possible to trace the origin and examine the nature of a phenomenon so striking and so universal.

The secret of the manner will not long escape us if we notice or can disengage the intention with which, willingly or unwillingly, this manner has been adopted. Nor is this intention very hard to discover. It is, as it appears to me, a desire to present the subject,

(1) I cannot refrain from noticing an instance from this writer of the absurdity into which the passion for picturesque epithet betrays many contemporary authors. At Newbury, we are told, "the London train bands flung Rupert's horsemen *roughly* off their front of pikes." Here *roughly* is in the Polonian sense "good." Visions of the sturdy and pious citizen discomfiting the debauched cavalier are aroused. But let us consider it with the sobriety proper to history and to art, and perhaps we shall ask Mr. Green to show us how to fling an enemy *softly* off a pike. Roaring like a sucking-dove would be nothing to this gymnastic effort.

whatever it may be, to the reader in the most striking and arresting fashion. The attention of the reading public generally has, from causes to be presently noticed, become gradually concentrated almost wholly upon subject-matter. Among what may be called, intellectually speaking, the lower classes, this concentration shows itself not in the preference but in the exclusive study of novels, newspapers, and sometimes of so-called books of information. A book must be as they say "about something," or it fails altogether to arrest their attention. To such persons a page with (as it has been quaintly put) no "resting-places," no proper names and capital letters to fix the eye, is an intolerable weariness, and to them it is evident that style can be only a name. Somewhat above them come the (intellectually) middle classes. They are not absolutely confined to personal adventure, real or fictitious, or to interesting facts. They can probably enjoy the better class of magazine articles, superior biographies, travels, and the other books that everybody reads and nobody buys. This class will even read poetry if the poet's name be known, and would consider it a grave affront if it were hinted to them that their appreciation of style is but dull and faulty. A certain amount of labour is therefore required on work which is to please these readers: labour, however, which is generally bestowed in a wrong direction, on ornament and trick rather than on really artistic construction and finish. Lastly there is the highest class of all, consisting of those who really possess, or might possess, taste, culture, and intellect. Of these the great majority are now somewhat alienated from pure literature, and devoted rather to social matters, to science, or to the more fashionable and profitable arts of design. Their demand for style in literature is confined chiefly to poetry. They also are interested more by their favourite subjects treated anyhow, than by subjects for which they care little treated well, so that even by them little encouragement is given to the cultivation and little hinderance to the decay of prose style.

Intimately connected with the influences that arise from this attitude and temper of the general reader, are certain influences which spring from such prevalent forms and subjects of literature as present themselves to the general writer. The first of these forms, and unquestionably the most constant and pervading in its influence, is now, as it was in De Quincey's days, journalism. No one with the slightest knowledge of the subject will pretend that the influence of journalism upon writing is wholly bad. Whatever may have been the case formerly, a standard of excellence which is in some respects really high is usually aimed at, and not seldom reached, in the better class of newspapers. Some appropriateness in the use of words, a rigid avoidance of the more glaring grammatical errors, and a respectable degree of clearness in statement, are expected by the reader and usually observed by the writer. In

these respects, therefore, there is no falling off to be complained of, but rather a marked improvement upon past times to be perceived. Yet, as regards the higher excellences of style, it is not possible that the influence of journalism should be good. For it must at any cost be rapid, and rapidity is absolutely incompatible with style. The journalist has as a rule one of two things to do; he has either to give a rapid account of certain facts, or to present a rapid discussion of certain arguments. In either case it becomes a matter of necessity for him to adopt stereotyped phrases and forms of speech which, being ready cut and dried, may abbreviate his labour and leave him as little as possible to invent in his limited time. Now there is nothing more fatal to the attainment of a good style than the habit of using such stereotyped phrases and forms. With the imperiousness natural to all art, style absolutely refuses to avail itself of, or to be found in company with, anything that is ready made. The rule must be a leaden one, the mould made for the occasion, and broken after it has passed. Every one who has ever seriously tried to write must be conscious how sorely he has been beset, and how often he has been overcome, by the almost insensible temptation to adopt the current phrases of the day. Bad, however, as the influence of journalism is in this respect, it is perhaps worse in its tendency to sacrifice everything to mere picturesqueness of style (for the word must be thus misused because there is no other). The journalist is bound to be picturesque by the law of his being. The old phrase, *seguis irritant*, is infinitely truer of pseudo-picturesque style as compared with literature which holds to its proper means of appeal, than it is of literal spectacle as compared with narrative. And the journalist is obliged at any cost *irritare animos*, and that in the least possible time.

This tendency of journalism is assisted and intensified by that of another current form of literature, novel-writing. A very little thought will show that if the novel-writer attains to style it is almost a marvel. Of the four constituent elements of the novel, plot, character, description, and dialogue, none lend themselves in any great degree to the cultivation of the higher forms of style, and some are distinctly opposed to it. The most cunning plot may be developed equally in the style of Plato and in the style of a penny dreadful. Character drawing, as the novelist understands or should understand it, is almost equally unconnected with style. On the other hand description and dialogue, unless managed with consummate skill, distinctly tend to develop and strengthen the crying faults of contemporary style, its picturesqueness at any cost, its gasping and ungraceful periods, its neglect of purely literary effect.

Lastly, there must be noticed the enormous influence necessarily exerted by the growth of what is called scientific study (to use the

term in its largest and widest sense), and by the displacement in its favour of many, if not most, of the departments of literature which were most favourable to the cultivation of style. In whatever quarter we look, we shall see that the primary effort of the writer and the primary desire of the reader are both directed to what are called scientific or positive results, in other words to matter instead of manner. In using the word science here, I have not the slightest intention of limiting its meaning, as it is too often limited, to physical science. I extend it to every subject which is capable of being treated in a scientific way. And I think we shall find that all subjects and all kinds of prose literature which are not capable of this sort of treatment, or do not readily lend themselves to it, are yearly occupying less and less the attention of both artists and audiences. Parliamentary oratory, which furnished a vigorous if a somewhat dangerous stimulant to the cultivation of style, is dead utterly. Pulpit eloquence, which at its worst maintained stylistic traditions, and at its best furnished some of the noblest examples of style, is dying, partly owing to the persistent refusal of the men of best culture and abilities to enter the clerical profession, partly to the absence of the serene security of a settled doctrine and position, but most of all to the demands upon the time of the clergy which modern notions enforce, and which make it utterly impossible for the greater number to devote a proper time to study. Philosophy, another great nurse of style, has now turned stepmother, and turns out her nurselings to wander in "thorniest queaches" of terminology and jargon, instead of the ordered gardens wherein Plato and Berkeley walked. History even, the last or almost the last refuge of a decent and comely prose, is more busy about records and manuscripts than about periods and paragraphs. Only criticism, the youngest and most hopeful birth of time as far as prose style is concerned, has not yet openly apostatized. It is true that even here signs of danger are not wanting, and that already we are told that criticism must be scientific, that its reading must not be desultory, and so forth. But on the whole there is little fear of relapse. The man who would cut himself a coat from another's cloth must bring to the task the knowledge and genius, the care and labour, of a skilled fashioner if he is to make good his claim of ownership. The man who has good work in perpetual contemplation is not likely to be satisfied with the complacent production of what is bad.

There is, moreover, one influence, or rather one set of influences, hostile to the attainment of style in the present day which I have as yet left unnoticed, and the approach to which is guarded by ground somewhat dangerous to the tread. It will, I think, appear to any one who contemplates the subject fully and impartially that style is essentially an aristocratic thing; and it is already a commonplace

to say that the spirit of to-day, or perhaps the spirit of the times immediately behind us, is essentially democratic. It is democratic not in any more political sense, but in the intolerance with which it regards anything out of the reach of, or incomprehensible to, the ordinary Philistine, working by the methods of Philistia. Intellectual and artistic pre-eminence, except in so far as it ministers to the fancies of the vulgar (great or small), is perhaps especially the object of this intolerance. Every one has witnessed or shared the angry impatience with which the ordinary Briton resents anything esoteric, fastidious, or fine. And the charms of prose style especially merit these epithets, and are not to be read by any one who runs, or tasted by any one who swallows in haste. Gaudy ornament is intelligible, graphic drawing is intelligible; but the finer cadences of the period, the more intricate strokes of composition, fall unregarded on the common ear and pass unnoticed by the common eye. To be tickled, to be dazzled, to be harrowed, are impressions of which the uncultured man is capable; they require little intellectual effort, and scarcely any judgment or taste in the direction of that little. But the music of the spheres would form but a sorry attraction in a music-hall programme, and Christopher Sly is not willing to accept nectar in exchange for a pot of even the smallest ale. And if the angry resentment of not a few readers gives the votary of style but little chance of an audience, it must be admitted that the lack of what I have called an aristocratic spirit gives the audience little chance of a performer. The conditions of modern life are unfavourable to the attainment of the peculiar mood of somewhat arrogant indifference which is the characteristic of the scholar. Every one knows Dean Gaisford's three reasons for the cultivation of the Greek language; and I for my part have no doubt that one of them most accurately describes an important feature of the *Wesen des Gelehrten*. It may not be necessary for him "to read the words of Christ in the original;" it may not be of absolute importance that he should "have situations of affluence opened to him." But it certainly is essential that he should "look down on his fellow-creatures from a proper elevation;" and this is what the tendency of modern social progress is making more and more difficult, at any rate in appearance. You cannot raise the level of the valleys without diminishing the relative height of the hills; and you cannot scatter education and elementary cultivation broadcast without diminishing the value of the privileges which appertain to superior culture. The old republic of letters was, like other old republics, a democracy only in name, but in reality a more or less close oligarchy, looking down on metics and slaves whose degradations and disabilities heightened its courage and gave a zest to its freedom. In letters, as in politics, we are doing our best to change all this; and the possible result may be,

that every one will soon be able to write a *Daily Telegraph* article, and that no one will aspire to anything beyond.¹

The general characteristics of style which the influence, combined or partial, of these forces has produced have been already indicated, but may perhaps now be summed up. Diffuseness; sacrifice of the graces of literary proportion to real or apparent clearness of statement; indulgence in cut-and-dried phrases; undue aiming at pictorial effect; gaudiness of unnatural ornament; preference of gross and glaring effects *en bloc* to careful composition. Certain authors who are either free from these defects or have vigour enough to excuse or transform them must now be noticed.

For reasons obvious, though various, it is not my intention to discuss in any way at the present time the style of the author of *Sartor Resartus*. Mr. Carlyle being thus removed, there can be little question who must take the foremost place in a discussion as to the merits and demerits of modern English prose style. And yet, audacious or paradoxical as the assertion may seem, it is at least doubtful whether in strictness we can assign to Mr. Ruskin a position in the very highest rank of writers if we are to adopt style as a criterion. The objection to his manner of writing is an obvious one, and one which he might very likely take as a compliment: it is too spontaneous in the first place, and too entirely subordinate to the subject in the second. I hope that it may be very clearly understood that I can see passages in *Modern Painters* and in the *Stones of Venice* (for I must be permitted to neglect the legions of little books with parody-provoking titles which have appeared in the last three lustres) which, for splendour of imaginative effect, for appropriateness of diction, for novelty and grandeur of conception, stand beyond all chance of successful rivalry, almost beyond all hope of decent parallel among the writings of ancient and modern masters. But in every case this marvellous effect will, when carefully examined, be found to depend on something wholly or partially extrinsic to the style. Mr. Ruskin writes beautifully because he thinks beautifully, because his thoughts spring, like Pallas, ready armed, and the fashion of the armour costs him nothing. Everybody has heard of the unlucky critic whose comment on Scott's fertility was that "the invention was not to be counted, for that came to him of its own accord." So it is with Mr. Ruskin. His beauties of style "come to him of their own accord," and then he writes as the very gods might dream of writing. But in the moments when he is off the

(1) I have for the present thought it better to leave out of consideration the probable effect of the diminished study of classics in modern school and university education. That this effect is decidedly adverse to the cultivation of style is sufficiently obvious, but the subject is too complicated to be incidentally treated, and perhaps the diminution itself is too recent for its effects to have been as yet much felt.

tripod, or is upon some casual and un-Delphic tripod of his own construction or selection, how is his style altered! The strange touches of unforseen colour become splashed and gaudy, the sonorous roll of the prophetic sentence-paragraphs drags and wriggles like a wounded snake, the cunning interweaving of scriptural or poetic phrase is patched and seamy. A Balaam on the Lord's side, he cannot curse or bless but as it is revealed to him, whereas the possessor of a great style can use it at will. He can shine on the just and on the unjust; can clothe his argument for tyranny or for liberty, for virtue or for vice, with the same splendour of diction, and the same unperturbed perfection of manner; can convince us, carry us with him, or leave us unconvinced but admiring, with the same unquestioned supremacy and the same unruffled calm. Swift can write a *jeu d'esprit* and a libel on the human race, a political pamphlet and a personal lampoon, with the same felicity and the same vigour. Berkeley can present tar-water and the Trinity, the theory of vision and the follies of contemporary free-thinking, with the same perfect lucidity and the same colourless fairness. But with Mr. Ruskin all depends on the subject, and the manner in which the subject is to be treated. He cannot even blame as he can praise; and there must be many who are ready to accept everything he can say of Tintoret or of Turner, and who feel no call to object to any of his strictures on Canaletto or on Claude, who yet perceive painfully the difference of style in the panegyrist and the detractor, and who would demand the stricter if less obvious justice, and the more artistic if apparently perverted sensitiveness, of the thorough master of style.

But if we have to quarrel with Mr. Ruskin because he has not sufficient command of the unquestioned beauties of his style, because he is not, in Carew's words—

"A king who rules as he thinks fit
The universal monarchy of wit,"

but is rather a slave to his own thoughts and fancies, a very opposite fault must be found with the next writer who falls to be mentioned. "We do not," says an author with whom I am surprised to find myself in even partial and temporary agreement, "we do not get angry so much with what Mr. Matthew Arnold says as with his insufferable manner of saying it." In other words, there is no fear of omitting to notice a deliberate command and peculiarity of manner in Mr. Arnold, whether that manner be considered "insufferable" or no. For myself I must confess, that though I have very rarely felt the least inclination to get angry with anything which the author of *Culture and Anarchy* may have chosen to say, and though I have in common with all the youth of Zion an immense debt to acknowledge to his vindication of our faith

and freedom from the chains of Philistia, yet I could very frequently find it in my heart to wish that Mr. Arnold had chosen any other style than that which appears to afford him such extreme delight. Irony is an admirable thing, but it must be grave and not grimacing. Innocence is an admirable thing, but it should not be affected. To have a manner of one's own is an admirable thing, but to have a mannerism of one's own is perhaps not quite so admirable. It is curious that his unfortunately successful pursuit of this latter possession should have led Mr. Arnold to adopt a style which has more than any other the fault he justly censured twenty years ago as the special vice of modern art—the fault of the *fantastic*. No doubt the great masters of style have each a *cachet* which is easily decipherable by a competent student; no doubt, in spite of Lord Macaulay, Arbuthnot is to be distinguished from Swift, and the cunningest imitators of Voltaire from Voltaire himself. But to simulate this distinction by the deliberate adoption of mere tricks and manners is what no true master of style ever yet attempted, because for no true master of style was it ever yet necessary. Mr. Ruskin, to use the old Platonic simile, has not his horses sufficiently well in hand; at times the heavenly steed, with a strong and sudden flight, will lift the car amid the empyrean, at times the earth-born yoke-fellow will drag it down, with scarcely the assistance and scarcely the impediment of the charioteer. But even this is better than the driving of one who has broken his horses, indeed, but has broken them to little but the mincing graces of the Lady's Mile.

It is not possible to speak with equal definiteness of the style of a third master of English prose, who ranks in point of age and of reputation with Mr. Ruskin and Mr. Arnold. It would certainly be an over-hasty or an ill-qualified critic who should assert that Mr. Froude's style is always faultless; but, on the other hand, it may be asserted, without any fear whatever of contradiction carrying weight, that at its best it is surpassed by no style of the present day, and by few of any other, and that at its worst its faults are, not of a venial character, for no fault in art is venial, but at any rate of a kind which may meet with more ready excuse than those of the writers previously noticed. These faults are perhaps two only—undue diffuseness and undue aiming at the picturesque. We have seen that these are the two most glaring faults of the age, and by his indulgence in them, and the splendid effects which he has produced by that indulgence, Mr. Froude has undoubtedly earned his place, if not as a *Säcularischer Mensch*, at any rate as a representative man. No one, perhaps, who has read can fail to count among the triumphs of English prose the descriptions of the Pilgrimage of Grace in the History, of Sir Richard Grenvil's last fight in the Short Studies, of the wreckers at Ballyhige in the English in

Ireland. There are also many shorter passages which exhibit almost every excellence that the most exacting critic could demand. But it is not to be denied that Mr. Froude has very frequently bowed the knee before the altar of Baal. It is unlawful to occupy twelve mighty volumes with the history of one nation during little more than half a century: it is unlawful for the sound critical reason of St. John, that if such a practice obtained universally, the world could not contain the books that should be written; and also for the reason that in such writing it is almost impossible to observe the reticence and compression which are among the lamps of style. It is unlawful to imagine and set down, except very sparingly, the colour of which the trees probably were at the time when kings and queens made their entrance into such and such a city, the buildings which they may or may not have looked upon, the thoughts which may or may not have occurred to them. Such sacrificings at the shrine of Effect, such trespassings on the domains and conveying of the methods of other arts and alien muses, are not to be commended or condoned. But one must, at the same time, allow with the utmost thankfulness that there are whole paragraphs, if not whole pages, of Mr. Froude's, which, for practised skill of composition and for legitimate beauty of effect, may take their place among the proudest efforts of English art.

It will probably be agreed that the three writers whom I have noticed stand at the head of contemporary English prose authors in point of age and authority; but there are other and younger authors who must necessarily be noticed in any account of the subject which aims at completeness. Mr. Swinburne's progress as a prose writer can hardly have failed to be a subject of interest, almost equally with his career as a poet, to every lover of our tongue. His earliest appearance, the *Essay on Byron*, is even now in many respects characteristic of his work; but it does not contain—and it is a matter of sincere congratulation for all lovers of English prose that it does not contain—any passage at all equal to the magnificent descant on Marlowe, which closes its ten years younger brother, the *Essay on Chapman*. In the work which has occupied this interval, the merits and defects of Mr. Swinburne as a prose writer may be read by whose wills. At times it has seemed as if the weeds would grow up with the good seed and choke it. Mr. Swinburne has fallen into the error, not unnatural for a poet, of forgetting that the figures and the language allowable in poetry are not also allowable in prose. The dangerous luxury of alliteration has attracted him only too often, and the still more dangerous license of the figure called chiasmus has been to him even as a siren, from whose clutches he has been hardly saved. But the noticeable thing is that the excellences of his prose speech have grown ever stronger and its

weaknesses weaker since he began. In the *Essay on Blake*, admirable as was much thereof, a wilful waste of language, not unfrequently verging on a woful want of sense, was too frequently apparent. In the *Notes on his Poems*, and in *Under the Microscope*, just as was most of the counter-criticism, it was impossible not to notice a tendency to verbiage and a proneness, I will not say to prefer sound to sense, but unnecessarily to reinforce sense with sound. But at the same time, in the *Essays and Studies*, and the *Essay on Chapman*, no competent critic could fail to notice, notwithstanding occasional outbreaks, the growing reticence and severity of form, as well as the increasing weight and dignity of meaning. Mr. Swinburne, as a prose writer, is in need of nothing but the pruning-hook. Most of his fellows are in want chiefly of something which might be worth pruning.

It is obviously impossible in the present article to notice minutely all even of the more prominent names in contemporary prose. Some there are among the older of our writers who yet retain the traditions of the theological school of writing, to which style owes so much. A good deal might be said of Cardinal Manning's earlier style (for his progress in this hierarchy has hardly corresponded with his promotion in the other), as well as of Dr. Newman's admirable clearness and form, joined as it is, perhaps unavoidably, to a certain hardness of temper. Mr. Disraeli's stylistic peculiarities would almost demand an essay to themselves. They have never perhaps had altogether fair play; for novel-writing and politics are scarcely friends to style. But Mr. Disraeli has the root of the matter in him, and has never been guilty of the degradation of the sentence, which is the crying sin of modern prose; while his unequalled felicity in the selection of single epithets (witness the famous "*Batavian graces*" and a thousand others) gives him a supply of legitimate ornament which few writers have ever had at command. Tastes, I suppose, will always differ as to the question whether his ornamentation is not sometimes illegitimate. The parrot-cry of upholstery is easily raised. But I think we have at last come to see that rococo work is good and beautiful in its way, and he must be an ungrateful critic who objects to the somewhat lavish emeralds and rubies of the *Arabian Nights*. Of younger writers, there are not many whose merits it would be proper to specify in this place; while the prevailing defects of current style have been already fully noticed. But there is one book of recent appearance which sets the possibilities of modern English prose in the most favourable light, and gives the liveliest hope as to what may await us, if writers, duly heeding the temptations to which they are exposed, and duly availing themselves of the opportunities for study and imitation which are at their disposal, should set themselves seriously to work to

develop *pro virili* the prose resources of the English tongue. Of the merely picturesque beauty of Mr. Pater's *Studies in the History of the Renaissance*, there can be no necessity for me to say anything here. In the first place it cannot escape the notice of any one who reads the book, and in the second, if there be any truth in what has been already said, the present age by no means needs to be urged to cultivate or to appreciate this particular excellence. The important point for us is the purely formal or regular merit of this style, and this is to be viewed with other eyes and tested by other methods than those which are generally brought to bear by critics of the present day. The main point which I shall notice is the subordinate and yet independent beauty of the sentences when taken separately from the paragraph. This is a matter of the very greatest importance. In too much of our present prose the individual sentence is unceremoniously robbed of all proper form and comeliness. If it adds its straw to the heap, its duty is supposed to be done. Mr. Pater has not fallen in this error, nor has he followed the multitude to do evil in the means which he has adopted for the production of the singular "sweet attractive kind of grace" which distinguishes these *Studies*. A bungler would have depended, after the fashion of the day, upon strongly coloured epithets, upon complicated and quasi-poetic cadences of phrase, at least upon an obtrusively voluptuous softness of thought and a cumbrous protraction of sentence. Not so Mr. Pater. There is not to be discovered in his work the least sacrifice of the phrase to the word, of the clause to the phrase, of the sentence to the clause, of the paragraph to the sentence. Each holds its own proper place and dignity while contributing duly to the dignity and place of its superior in the hierarchy. Let any reader turn to pp. 15, 16, or pp. 118, 119, of the book, and see, as he cannot fail to see, the extraordinary mastery with which this complicated success is attained. Often the cadence of the sentence considered separately will seem to be—and will in truth be—quite different from that of the paragraph, because its separate completeness demands this difference. Yet the total effect, so far from being marred, is enhanced. There is no surer mark of the highest style than this separate and yet subordinate finish. In the words of Mr. Ruskin, it is "so modulated that every square inch is a perfect composition."

It is this perfection of modulation to which we must look for the excellence that we require and do not meet with in most of the work of the present day, and it is exactly this modulation with which all the faults that I have had to comment upon in the preceding pages are inconsistent. To an artist who should set before him such a model as either of the passages which I have quoted, lapses into such faults would be impossible. He will not succumb to the easy diffuseness which may obliterate the just proportion and

equilibrium of his periods. He will not avail himself of the ready assistance of stereotyped phraseology to spare himself the trouble of casting new moulds and devising new patterns. He will not imagine that he is a scene painter instead of a prose writer, a decorator instead of an architect, a caterer for the desires of the many instead of a priest to the worship of the few. He will not indulge in a style which requires the maximum of ornament in order to disguise and render palatable the minimum of art and of thought. He will not consider it his duty to provide, at the least possible cost of intellectual effort on the part of the reader, something which may delude him into the idea that he is exercising his judgment and his taste. And, above all, he will be careful that his sentences have an independent completeness and harmony, no matter what purpose they may be designed to fulfil. For the sentence is the unit of style; and by the cadence and music, as well as by the purport and bearing, of his sentences, the master of style must stand or fall. For years, almost for centuries, French prose has been held up as a model to English prose writers, and for the most part justly. Only of late has the example come to have something of the Helot about it. The influence of Victor Hugo—an influence almost omnipotent among the younger generation of French literary men—has been exercised in prose with a result almost as entirely bad as its effect in verse has been good. The rules of verse had stiffened and cramped French poetry unnaturally, and violent exercise was the very thing required to recover suppleness and strength; but French prose required no such surgery, and it has consequently lost its ordered beauty without acquiring compensatory charms. The proportions of the sentence have been wilfully disregarded, and the result is that French prose is probably now at a lower point of average merit than at any time for two centuries.

That an art should be fully recognised as an art, with strict rules and requirements, is necessary to attainment of excellence in it; and in England this recognition, which poetry has long enjoyed, has hardly yet been granted to prose. No such verses as we find by scores in such books as Marston's *Satires* would now suggest themselves as possible or tolerable to any writer of Marston's powers; but in prose many a sentence quite as intolerable as any of these verses is constantly written by persons of presumably sound education and competent wits. The necessities of the prose writer are, an ear in the first place: this is indispensable and perhaps not too common. In the second place, due study of the best authors, as well to know what to avoid as what to imitate. Lastly, care, which perhaps is not too much to demand of any artist, so soon as he has recognised and has secured recognition of the fact that he is an artist. Care is

indeed the one thrice-to-be-repeated and indispensable property of the prose writer. It is pre-eminently necessary to him for the very reason that it is so easy to dispense with it, and to write prose without knowing what one does. Verse, at least verse which is to stand, as Johnson says, "the test of the finger if not of the ear," cannot be written without conscious effort and observation. But something which may be mistaken for prose can unfortunately be produced without either taste, or knowledge, or care. With these three requisites there should be no limit to the beauty and to the variety of the results obtained. The fitness of English for prose composition will hardly be questioned, though it may be contended with justice that perhaps in no other language has the average merit of its prose been so far below the excellence of its most perfect specimens. But the resources which in the very beginning of the practice of original composition in fully organised English could produce the splendid and thoughtful, if quaint and cumbrous, embroideries of Euphuus and the linked sweetness of the Arcadia, which could give utterance to the symphonies of Browne and Milton, which could furnish and suffice for the matchless simplicity of Bunyan, the splendid strength of Swift, the transparent clearness of Middleton and Berkeley, the stately architecture of Gibbon, are assuredly equal to the demands of any genius that may arise to employ them.

It is therefore the plain duty of every critic to assist at least in impressing upon the mass of readers that they do not receive what they ought to receive from the mass of writers, and in suggesting a multiplication and tightening of the requirements which a prosaist must fulfil. There are some difficulties in the way of such impression and suggestion in the matter of style. It is not easy for the critic to escape being bidden, in the words of Nicholas Breton, "not to talk too much of it, having so little of it," or to avoid the obvious jest of Diderot on Beccaria, that he had written an "*ouvrage sur le style où il n'y a point de style*." For, unluckily, fault-finding is an ungracious business, and in criticising prose as prose the criticism has to be mostly fault-finding, the pleasanter if even harder task of discriminating appreciation being as a rule withheld from the critic. But I can see no reason why this state of things should continue, and I know no Utopia which ought to be more speedily rendered *topic*, than that in which at least the same censure which is now incurred by a halting verse, a discordant rhyme, or a clumsy stanza, should be accorded to a faultily-arranged clause, to a sentence of inharmonious cadence, to a paragraph of irregular and ungraceful architecture.

GEORGE SAINTSBURY.

THE MYTH OF DEMETER AND PERSEPHONE.¹

THE stories of the Greek mythology, like other things which belong to no man, and for which no one in particular is responsible, had their fortunes. In this world of floating fancies there was a struggle for life; there were myths which never emerged from that first state of popular conception, or were absorbed by stronger competitors, because, as some true heroes have done, they lacked the sacred poet or prophet, and were never remodelled by literature; while out of the myth of Demeter, cared for by art and poetry, came the little pictures of the Homeric hymn, and the gracious imagery of Praxiteles. The myth has now entered its second or poetical phase then, in which more definite fancies are grouped about the primitive stock in a literary temper, and the whole interest settles round the images of the beautiful girl going down into the darkness, and the weary woman who seeks her lost daughter; divine persons, then sincerely believed in by the majority of the people. The Homeric hymn is the central monument of this second phase. In it, the changes of the natural year have become a personal history, a story of human affection and sorrow, yet with a far-reaching religious significance also, of which the mere earthly spring and autumn are but an analogy; and in the development of this human element, the writer of the Homeric hymn sometimes displays a genuine power of pathetic expression. The whole episode of the rearing of Demophoon, in which human longing and regret are blent so subtly, over the poor body of the dying child, with the mysterious design of the goddess to make the child immortal, is an excellent example of the sentiment of pity in literature. Yet though it has reached the stage of literary interpretation, much of the early mystical character still lingers about the story, as it is here told. Later mythologists simply define the personal history; but in this hymn we may again and again trace curious links of connexion with the original meaning of the myth. Its subject is the weary woman indeed, the *mater dolorosa* of the ancient world, but with a certain latent reference all through to the mystical person of the earth. Her robe of dark blue is the raiment of her mourning, but also the blue robe of the earth in shadow, as we see it in Titian's landscapes; her great age is the age of the immemorial earth; she becomes a nurse, therefore, holding Demophoon in her bosom; the folds of her garment are fragrant, not merely with the incense of Eleusis, but with the natural scents of flowers and fruit. The sweet breath with which she nourishes the

(1) Concluded from the *Fortnightly Review* for January.

child Demophoon, is the warm west wind, feeding all germs of vegetable life; her bosom, where he lies, is the bosom of the earth, with its strengthening heat, reserved and shy, and angry if human eyes scrutinise too closely its secret chemistry; it is with the earth's surface of varied colour that she has "in time past pleased the sun;" the yellow hair which falls suddenly over her shoulders, at her transformation in the house of Celeus, is still partly the golden corn—in art and poetry she is ever the blond goddess; tarrying in her temple, of which an actual hollow in the earth is the prototype, among the spicy odours of the Eleusinian ritual, she is the spirit of the earth, lying hidden in its dark folds until the return of spring, among the flower-seeds and fragrant roots, like the seeds and aromatic woods hidden in the wrappings of the dead. All through the poem we have a sense of a certain nearness to nature, surviving from an earlier world; the sea is understood as a person, yet is still the real sea, with its waves moving. When it is said that no bird gave Demeter tidings of Persephone, we feel that to that earlier world, ways of communication between all creatures may have seemed open, which are closed to us. It is Iris who brings to Demeter the message of Zeus; that is, the rainbow signifies to the earth the good-will of the rainy sky towards it. Persephone springing up with great joy from the couch of Aidoneus, to return to her mother, is the sudden outburst of the year. The heavy and narcotic aroma of spring flowers hangs about her, as about the actual spring. And this mingling of the primitive import of the myth with the later personal interests of the story, is curiously illustrated by the place which the poem assigns to Hecate. This strange Titaness is first a nymph only; afterwards, as if changed incurably by the passionate cry of Persephone, she becomes her constant attendant, and is even identified with her. But in the Homeric hymn her lunar character is clear; she is really the moon only, who hears the cry of Persephone, as the sun saw her, when Aidoneus carried her away. One morning, as the mother wandered, the moon appeared, as it does in its last quarter, rising very bright, just before dawn; that is, "on the tenth morning Hecate met her, having a light in her hands." The fascinating, but enigmatical figure, "sitting ever in her cave, half-veiled with a shining veil, thinking delicate thoughts," in which we seem to see the subject of some picture of the Italian Renaissance, is the lover of Endymion, like Persephone, withdrawn, in her season, from the eyes of men. The sun saw her; the moon saw her not, but heard her cry, and is ever after the half-veiled attendant of the queen of the dead and of dreams.

But the story of Demeter and Persephone lends itself naturally to description, and it is in descriptive beauties that the Homeric hymn excels; its episodes are finished designs, and directly stimulate the

painter and the sculptor to a rivalry with them. Weaving the names of the flowers into his verse, names familiar to us in English, though their Greek originals are uncertain, the writer sets Persephone before us, herself like one of them—*καλυκῶπις*—like the budding calyx of a flower—in a picture, which in its mingling of a quaint freshness and simplicity with a certain earnestness, reads like a description of some early Florentine design, such as Sandro Botticelli's *Allegory of the Seasons*. By an exquisite chance also, a common metrical expression connects the perfume of the newly created narcissus with the salt odour of the sea. Like one of those early designs again, but with a deeper infusion of religious earnestness, is the picture of Demeter sitting at the wayside, in shadow as always, with the well of water and the olive-tree. She has been journeying all night, and now it is morning, and the daughters of Celeus bring their vessels to draw water. That image of the seated Demeter, resting after her long flight "through the dark continent," or in the house of Celeus, when she refuses the red wine, or again, solitary, in her newly-finished temple of Eleusis, enthroned in her grief, fixed itself deeply on the Greek imagination, and became a favourite subject of Greek artists. When the daughters of Celeus come to conduct her to Eleusis, they come as in a Greek frieze, full of energy and motion and waving lines, but with gold and colours upon it. Eleusis—coming—the *coming* of Demeter thither, as thus told in the Homeric hymn, is the central instance in Greek mythology of such divine appearances. "She leaves for a season the company of the gods and abides among men," and men's merit is to receive her in spite of appearances. Metaneira and others in the Homeric hymn partly detect her divine character; they find a *χάρις*, a certain divine air about her, which makes them think her perhaps a royal person in disguise. She becomes in her long wanderings almost wholly humanised, and in return, she and Persephone, alone of the Greek gods, seem to have been the objects of a sort of personal love and loyalty. Yet they are ever the solemn goddesses, *θαὶ σεμναὶ*, the word expressing religious awe, the Greek sense of the divine presence.

Plato, in laying down the rules by which the poets are to be guided in speaking about divine things to the citizens of the ideal republic, forbids all those episodes of mythology which represent the gods as assuming various forms, and visiting the earth in disguise. Below the express reasons which he assigns for this rule, we may perhaps detect that instinctive antagonism to the old Heraclitean philosophy of perpetual change, which forces him, in his theory of morals and the state, of poetry and music, of dress and manners even, and of style in the very vessels and furniture of daily life, on an austere simplicity, the older Dorian or Egyptian type of a rigid, eternal immobility. The disintegrating, centrifugal influence, which

had penetrated, as he thought, political and social existence, making men too myriad-minded, had laid hold on the life of the gods also, and, even in their calm sphere, one might hardly identify a single divine person as himself, and not another. * There must then be no doubling, no disguises, no stories of transformation. The modern reader, however, will hardly acquiesce in this improvement of Greek mythology. He finds in these stories, like that, for instance, of the appearance of Athene to Telemachus, in the first book of the *Odyssey*, which has a quite biblical mysticity and solemnity, stories in which, the hard material outline breaking up, the gods lay aside their visible form like a garment, and remain themselves, not the least spiritual element of Greek religion, an evidence of the sense in them of unseen presences, which might at any moment cross a man's path, to be recognised, in half disguise, by the more delicately trained eye, here or there, by one and not by another. Whatever religious elements they lacked, they had at least this sense of remote and subtler ways of personal presence.

We have to travel a long way from the Homeric hymn to the hymn of Callimachus, who writes in the end of Greek literature, in the third century before Christ, in celebration of the procession of the sacred basket of Demeter, not at the Attic, but at the Alexandrian Eleusinia. He develops, in something of the prosaic spirit of a medieval writer of mysteries, one of the burlesque incidents of the story, the insatiable hunger which seized on Erysichthon because he cut down a grove sacred to the goddess. Yet he finds his opportunities for skilful touches of poetry. "As the four white horses draw her sacred basket," he says, "so will the great goddess bring us a *white* spring, a *white* summer." He describes the grove itself, with its hedge of trees, so thick that an arrow could hardly pass through, its pines and fruit-trees, and tall poplars within, and the water, like pale gold, running from the conduits. It is one of those famous poplars that receives the first stroke; it sounds heavily to its companion trees, and Demeter perceives that her sacred grove is suffering. Then comes one of those transformations which Plato will not allow. Vainly anxious to save the lad from his ruin, she appears in the form of a priestess, but with the long hood of the goddess, and the poppy in her hand; and there is something of a real shudder, some still surviving sense of a haunting presence among the trees, in the verses which describe her sudden revelation, when the workmen flee away, leaving their axes in the cleft trees.

Of the same age as the hymn of Callimachus, but with very different qualities, is the idyll of Theocritus on the *Shepherds' Journey*. Although it is possible to define an epoch in mythological development in which literary and artificial influences began to remodel the primitive, popular legend, yet still, among children, and

unchanging childlike people, we may suppose that that primitive stage always survived, and the old instinctive influences were still at work. As the subject of popular religious celebrations also, the myth was still the property of the people, and surrendered to its capricious action. The shepherds in Theocritus, on their way to celebrate one of the more homely feasts of Demeter about the time of harvest, are examples of these childlike people; the age of the poets has long since come, but they are of the older and simpler order, lingering on in the midst of a more conscious world. In an idyll, itself full of the delightful gifts of Demeter, Theocritus sets them before us; through the blazing summer day's journey, the smiling image of the goddess is always before them. And now they have reached the end of their journey:

"So I, and Eucritus, and the fair Amyntichus, turned aside into the house of Phrasidamus, and lay down with delight in beds of sweet tamarisk and fresh cuttings from the vines, strewn on the ground. Many poplars and elm-trees were waving over our heads, and not far off the running of the sacred water from the cave of the nymphs warbled to us; in the shimmering branches the sun-burnt grasshoppers were busy with their talk, and from afar the little owl cried softly out of the tangled thorns of the blackberry; the larks were singing and the hedge-birds, and the turtle-dove moaned; the bees flew round and round the fountains, murmuring softly; the scent of late summer and the fall of the year was everywhere; the pears fell from the trees at our feet, and apples in number rolled down at our sides, and the young plum-trees were bent to the earth with the weight of their fruit. The wax, four years old, was loosed from the heads of the wine-jars. O! nymphs of Castalia, who dwell on the steep of Parnassus, tell me, I pray you, was it a draught like this that the aged Chiron placed before Hercules, in the stony cave of Pholus? Was it nectar like this that made the mighty shepherd on Anapus' shore, Polyphemus, who flung the rocks upon Ulysses' ships, dance among his sheepfolds?—A cup like this ye poured out now upon the altar of Demeter, who presides over the threshing-floor. May it be mine once more to thrust my big winnowing-fan through her heaps of corn; and may I see her smile upon me, holding poppies and handfuls of corn in her two hands!"

Some of the modifications of the story of Demeter, as we find it in later poetry, have been supposed to be due, not to the genuine action of the Greek mind, but to the influence of that so-called Orphic literature, which, in the generation succeeding Hesiod, brought from Thessaly and Phrygia a tide of mystical ideas into the Greek religion, sometimes, doubtless, confusing the clearness and naturalness of its original outlines, but also sometimes imparting to them a new and peculiar grace. Under the influence of this Orphic

poetry, Demeter was blended, or identified, with Rhea Cybele, the mother of the gods, the wilder earth-goddess of Phrygia; and the romantic figure of Dionysus Zagreus, Dionysus *the Hunter*, that most interesting, though somewhat melancholy variation on the better known Dionysus, was brought, as son or brother of Persephone, into her circle, the mystical vine, who, as Persephone descends and ascends from the earth, is rent to pieces by the Titans every year and remains long in Hades, but every spring-time comes out of it again, renewing his youth. This identification of Demeter with Rhea Cybele is the motive which has inspired a beautiful chorus in the *Helena*, the new *Helena*, of Euripides, that great lover of all subtle refinements and modernisms, who, in this play, has worked on a strange version of the older story, which relates that only the phantom of Helen had really gone to Troy, herself remaining in Egypt all the time, at the court of King Proteus, where she is found at last by her husband Menelaus. The chorus has even less than usual to do with the action of the play, being linked to it only by a sort of parallel which may be understood between Menelaus seeking Helen, and Demeter seeking Persephone. Euripides then takes the matter of the Homeric hymn into the region of a higher and swifter poetry, and connects them with the more stimulating imagery of the Idæan mother. The Orphic mysticism or enthusiasm has been admitted into the story, which is now full of excitement, the motion of rivers, the sounds of the Bacchic cymbals heard over the mountains, as Demeter wanders among the woody valleys seeking her lost daughter, all directly expressed in the vivid Greek words. Demeter is no longer the subdued goddess of the quietly-ordered fields, but the mother of the gods, who has her abode in the heights of Mount Ida, who presides over the dews and waters of the white springs, whose flocks feed, not on grain, but on the curling tendrils of the vine, both of which she withholds in her anger, and whose chariot is drawn by wild beasts, fruit and emblem of the earth in its fiery strength. Not Hecate, but Pallas and Artemis in full armour, swift-footed, vindicators of chastity, accompany her in her search for Persephone, who is already expressly, *κῆρη ἄπρητος*. When she rests from her long wanderings, it is into the stony thickets of Mount Ida, deep with snow, that she throws herself, in her deep grief. When Zeus desires to end her pain, the Muses and the solemn Graces are sent to dance and sing before her. It is then that Cypris, the goddess of beauty, and the original cause, therefore, of her distress, takes into her hands the brazen tambourines of the Dionysiac worship with their Chthonian or deep-noted sound; and it is she, not the old Iambe, who with this wild music, heard thus for the first time, makes Demeter smile at last. "Great," so the chorus ends with a picture, "great is the power of the stoles of spotted

fawn-skins, and the green leaves of ivy twisted about the sacred wands, and the wheeling motion of the tambourine whirled round in the air, and the long hair floating unbound in honour of Bromius, and the nocturnes of the goddess, when the moon looks full upon them."

The poem of Claudian on the *Rape of Proserpine*, the longest extant work connected with the story of Demeter, yet itself unfinished, closes the world of classical poetry. Writing in the fourth century of the Christian æra, Claudian has his subject before him in the whole extent of its various development, and also profits by those many pictorial representations of it, which, from the famous picture of Polygnotus downwards, delighted the ancient world. His poem, then, besides having an intrinsic charm, is valuable for some reflection in it of those lost works, being itself pre-eminently a work in colour, and excelling in a kind of painting in words, which brings its subject very pleasantly almost to the eye of the reader. The mind of this late votary of the old gods, in a world rapidly changing, is crowded by all the beautiful forms generated by mythology, and now about to be forgotten. In this after-glow of Latin literature, lighted up long after their fortune had set, and just before their long night began, they pass before us in his verses with the utmost clearness, like the figures in an actual procession. The nursing of the infant Sun and Moon by Tethys; Proserpine and her companions gathering flowers at early dawn, when the violets are drinking in the dew, still lying white upon the grass; the image of Pallas winding the peaceful blossoms about the steel crest of her helmet; the realm of Proserpine, softened somewhat by her coming, and filled with a quiet joy; the matrons of Elysium crowding to her marriage toilet, with the bridal veil of yellow in their hands; the Manes crowned with ghostly flowers and warmed a little at the marriage feast; the ominous dreams of the mother; the desolation of the home, like an empty bird's-nest or an empty fold, when she returns and finds Proserpine gone, and the spider at work over her unfinished embroidery; the strangely-figured raiment, the flowers in the grass, which were once blooming youths, having both their natural colour and the colour of their poetry in them, and the clear little fountain there, which was once the maiden Cyane; all this is shown in a series of descriptions, like the designs in some unwinding tapestry, like Proserpine's own embroidery, the description of which is the most brilliant of these pictures, and, in its quaint confusion of the images of philosophy with those of mythology, anticipates something of the fancy of the Italian Renaissance.

"Proserpina, filling the house soothingly with her low song, was working a gift against the return of her mother, with labour all to

be in vain. In it she marked out with her needle the houses of, the gods and the series of the elements, showing by what law, nature, the parent of all, settled the strife of ancient times, and the seeds of things departed into their right places; the lighter elements are borne aloft, the heavier fall to the centre; the air grows light with heat, a blazing light whirls round with the firmament; the sea flows; the earth hangs suspended in its place. And there were divers colours in it; she illuminated the stars with gold, infused a purple shade into the water, and heightened the shore with gems of flowers; and under her skilful hand the threads, with their inwrought lustre, swell up, in momentary counterfeit of the waves; you might think that the sea-wind flapped against the rocks, and that a hollow murmur came creeping over the thirsty sands. She puts in the five zones, marking with a red ground the midmost zone, possessed by burning heat; its outline was parched and stiff; the threads seemed thirsty with the constant sunshine; on either side lay the two zones proper for human life, where a gentle temperance reigns; and at the extremes she drew the twin zones of numbing cold, making her work dun and sad with the hues of perpetual frost. She paints in, too, the sacred places of Dis, her father's brother, and the Manes, so fatal to her; and an omen of her doom was not wanting; for, as she worked, as if with foreknowledge of the future, her face became wet with a sudden burst of tears. And now, in the utmost border of the tissue, she had begun to wind in the wavy line of the river Oceanus, with its glassy shallows; but the door sounds on its hinges, and she perceives the goddesses coming; the unfinished work drops from her hands, and a ruddy blush lights up in her clear and snow-white face."

I have reserved to the last what is perhaps the daintiest treatment of this subject in classical literature, the account of it which Ovid gives in the *Fasti*, a kind of Roman Calendar, for the seventh of April, the day of the games of Ceres. He tells over again the old story, with much of which, he says, the reader will be already familiar; but he has something also of his own to add to it, which the reader will hear for the first time; and like one of those old painters who, in depicting a scene of Christian history, drew from their own fancy or experience its special setting and accessories, he translates the story into something very different from the Homeric hymn. The writer of the Homeric hymn had made Celeus a king, and represented the scene at Eleusis in a fair palace, like the Venetian painters who depict the persons of the Holy Family with royal ornaments. Ovid, on the other hand, is more like certain painters of the early Florentine school, who represent the holy persons among the more touching circumstances of humble life; and the special something of his own which he adds, is a pathos caught

from homely things, not without a delightful, just perceptible, shade of humour even, so rare in such work. All the mysticism has disappeared; but instead we trace something of that "worship of sorrow," which has been sometimes supposed to have had no place in classical religious sentiment. In Ovid's well-finished elegiacs, the *Anthology* reaches its utmost delicacy; but I give here the following episode for the sake of its pathetic expression.

"After many wanderings Ceres had come to Attica. There, in the utmost dejection, for the first time, she sat down to rest on a bare stone, which the people of Attica still call the *stone of sorrow*. For many days she remained there motionless, under the open sky, heedless of the rain and of the frosty moonlight. Places have their fortunes; and what is now the illustrious town of Eleusis was then the field of an old man named Ccleus. He was carrying home a load of acorns, and wild berries shaken down from the brambles, and dry wood for burning on the hearth; his little daughter was leading two goats home from the hills; and at home there was a little boy lying sick in his cradle. 'Mother,' said the little girl—and the goddess was moved at the name of mother—'what do you, all alone in this solitary place?' The old man stopped too, in spite of his heavy burden, and bade her take shelter in his cottage, though it was but a little one. But at first she refused to come; she looked like an old woman, and an old woman's coif confined her hair; and as the man still urged her, she said to him, 'Heaven bless you, and may children always be yours! My daughter has been stolen from me. Alas! how much happier is your lot than mine;' and, though weeping is impossible for the gods, as she spoke, a bright drop like a tear fell into her bosom. Soft-hearted, the little girl and the old man weep together. And after that the good man said, 'Arise! despise not the shelter of my little home; so may the daughter whom you seek be restored to you.' 'Lead me,' answered the goddess; 'you have found out the secret of moving me;' and she arose from the stone, and followed the old man; and as they went he told her of the sick child at home—how he is restless with pain, and cannot sleep. And she, before entering the little cottage, gathered from the untended earth the soothing and sleep-giving poppy; and as she gathered it, it is said that she forgot her vow, and tasted of the seeds, and broke her long fast, unaware. As she came through the door, she saw the house full of trouble, for now there was no more hope of life for the sick boy. She saluted the mother, whose name was Metaneira, and humbly kissed the lips of the child, with her own divine lips; then the paleness left its face, and suddenly the parents see the strength returning to its body; so great is the force that comes from the divine mouth. And the whole family was full of joy—the mother and the father and the little girl; they were the whole household."

IV.

Three profound ethical conceptions, three impressive sacred figures, have now defined themselves for the Greek imagination, condensed from all the traditions which have here been traced, from the hymns of the poets, from the instinctive and unformulated mysticism of primitive minds. Demeter has become the divine sorrowing mother. Kore, the goddess of summer, has become Persephone, the goddess of death, still associated with the forms and odours of flowers and fruit, yet as one risen from the dead also, presenting one side of her ambiguous nature to men's gloomier fancies. Thirdly, there is the image of Demeter enthroned, chastened by sorrow, and somewhat advanced in age, blessing the earth, in her joy at the return of Kore. The myth has now entered on the third phase of its life, in which it becomes the property of those more elevated spirits, who, in the decline of the Greek religion, pick and choose and modify, with perfect freedom of mind, whatever in it may seem adapted to minister to their culture. In this way, the myths of the Greek religion become parts of an ideal, sensible embodiments of the susceptibilities and intuitions of the nobler kind of souls; and it is to this latest phase of mythological development that the highest Greek sculpture allies itself. Its function is to give visible, æsthetic expression to the constituent parts of that ideal. As poetry dealt chiefly with the *incidents* of the story, so it is with the *personages* of the story—with Demeter and Kore themselves—that sculpture has to do.

For the myth of Demeter, like the Greek religion in general, had its unlovelier side, grotesque, un-hellenic, unglorified by art, illustrated well enough by the description Pausanias gives us of his visit to the cave of the Black Demeter at Phigalia. In his time the image itself had vanished; but he tells us enough about it to enable us to realise its general characteristics, monstrous as the special legend with which it was connected, the black draperies, the horse's head united to the woman's body, with the carved reptiles creeping about it. If with the thought of this gloomy image of our mother the earth, in our minds, we take up one of those coins which bear the image of Kore or Demeter,¹ we shall better understand what the function of sculpture really was in elevating and refining the religious conceptions of the Greeks. Looking on the profile, for instance, on one of those coins of Messene, which almost certainly represent Demeter, and noting the crisp, chaste opening of the lips, the minutely wrought earrings, and the delicately touched ears of corn—

(1) On these small objects the mother and daughter are hard to distinguish, the latter being recognisable only by a greater delicacy in the features and the more evident stamp of youth.

this trifle being justly regarded as, in its æsthetic qualities, an epitome of art on a larger scale—we shall see how far the imagination of the Greeks had travelled from what their Black Demeter shows us had once been possible for them, and in making the gods of their worship the objects of a worthy companionship in men's thoughts. Certainly, the mind of the old workman who struck this coin was, if we may trust the testimony of his work, unclouded by impure or gloomy shadows. The thought of Demeter is impressed here with all the purity and proportion, the purged and dainty intelligence of the human countenance. The mystery of it is indeed absent, perhaps could hardly have been looked for in so slight a thing, intended for no sacred purpose, and tossed lightly from hand to hand. But in his firm hold on the harmonies of the human face, the designer of this tranquil head of Demeter is on the one road to a command over the secrets of all imaginative pathos and mystery; though, in the perfect fairness and blitheness of his work, he might seem almost not to have known the incidents of her terrible story.

It is probable that, at a later period than in other equally important temples of Greece, the earlier archaic representation of Demeter in the sanctuary of Eleusis, was replaced by a more beautiful image in the new style, with face and hands of ivory, having therefore, in tone and texture, some subtler likeness to women's flesh, and the closely enveloping drapery being constructed in daintily beaten plates of gold. Demeter and Kore have been traced in certain blurred figures of the Parthenon, of the school of Pheidias, therefore; but Praxiteles seems to have been the first to bring into the region of a freer artistic handling these shy deities of the earth, shrinking still within the narrow restraints of a hieratic, conventional treatment, long after the more genuine Olympians had broken out of them. The school of Praxiteles, as distinguished from that of Pheidias, is especially the school of grace, relaxing a little the severe ethical tension of the latter, in favour of a slightly Asiatic sinuosity and tenderness. Pausanias tells us that he carved the two goddesses for the temple of Demeter at Athens; and Pliny speaks of two groups of his in brass, the one representing the stealing of Persephone, the other her later, annual descent into Hades, conducted thither by the now pacified mother. All alike have perished; though perhaps some more or less faint reflection of the most important of these designs may still be traced on many painted vases which depict the stealing of Persephone, a helpless, plucked flower in the arms of Aidoneus. And in this almost traditional form, the subject was often represented, in low relief, on tombs, some of which still remain, in one or two instances, built up, oddly enough, in the walls of Christian churches. On the tombs of women who had died in early life, this was a favourite sub-

ject, some likeness of the actual lineaments of the deceased being sometimes transferred to the features of Persephone.

Yet so far, it might seem, when we consider the interest of this story in itself, and its importance in the Greek religion, that no adequate expression of it had remained to us in works of art. But in the year 1857, Mr. Newton's discovery of the marbles in the sacred precinct of Demeter at Cnidus restored to us an illustration of the myth in its artistic phase, hardly less central than the Homeric hymn in its poetical phase. With the help of the descriptions and plans of Mr. Newton's book,¹ we can form, as one always wishes to do in such cases, a clear idea of the place where these marbles, three statues of the best style of Greek sculpture, now in the British Museum, were found. Occupying a ledge of rock, looking towards the sea, at the base of a cliff of upheaved limestone, of singular steepness and regularity of surface, the spot presents indications of volcanic disturbance, as if a chasm in the earth had opened here. It was this character, suggesting the belief in an actual connexion with the interior of the earth, local tradition claiming it as the scene of the stealing of Persephone, which probably gave rise, as in other cases where the landscape presented some peculiar feature in harmony with the story, to the dedication upon it of a house and an image of Demeter, with whom were associated Kore and the gods with Demeter—οἱ θεοὶ παρὰ Δαμάτρη—Aidoneus, and the mystical Dionysus. The house seems to have been a small chapel only, of simple construction, and designed for private use, the site itself having been private property, consecrated by a particular family, for their own religious uses, although other persons, servants or dependents of the founders, may also have frequented it. The architecture seems to have been insignificant, but the sculpture costly and exquisite, belonging, if contemporary with the erection of the building, to a great period of Greek art, of which also it is judged to possess intrinsic marks, about the year 350 before Christ, the probable date of the dedication of the little temple. The artists by whom these works were produced were therefore either the contemporaries of Praxiteles, whose Venus was for many centuries the glory of Cnidus, or belonged to the generation immediately succeeding him. The temple itself was probably thrown down by a renewal of the volcanic disturbances; the statues however remaining, and the ministers and worshippers still continuing to make shift for their sacred business in the place, now doubly venerable, but with its temple unrestored, down to the second or third century of the Christian era, its frequenters being now perhaps mere chance comers, the family of the original donors having become extinct, or having deserted it. Into this later arrangement, divined clearly by Mr.

(1) *A History of Discoveries at Halicarnassus, Cnidus, and Brancistæ.*

Newton, through those faint indications which mean much for true experts, the extant remains, as they were found upon the spot, permit us to enter. It is one of the graves of that old religion, but with much still fresh in it. We see it with its provincial superstitions, and its curious magic rites, but also with its means of really solemn impressions, in the culminating forms of Greek art; the two faces of the Greek religion confronting each other here, and the whole having that rare peculiarity of a kind of personal stamp upon it, the place having been designed to meet the fancies of one particular soul, or at least of one family. It is always difficult to bring the every-day aspect of Greek religion home to us; but even the slighter details of this little sanctuary help us to do this; and knowing little, as we do, of the greater mysteries of Demeter, this glance into an actual religious place dedicated to her, and with the air of her worship still about it, is doubly interesting. The little votive figures of the goddesses in baked earth were still lying stored in the small treasury intended for such objects, or scattered about the feet of the images, together with lamps in great number, a lighted lamp being a favourite offering, in memory of the torches with which Demeter sought Persephone, or from some sense of inherent darkness in these gods of the earth, those torches in the hands of Demeter being originally the artificial warmth and brightness of lamp and fire on winter nights. The *diræ* or spells, binding or devoting certain persons to the infernal gods, inscribed on thin rolls of lead, with holes sometimes for hanging them up about those quiet statues, still lay, just as they were left, anywhere within the sacred precinct, illustrating at once the gloomier side of the Greek religion in general, and of Demeter and Persephone especially, in their character of avenging deities, and, as relics of ancient magic reproduced so strangely at other times and places, reminding us of the permanence of certain odd ways of human thought. A woman binds with her spell the person who seduces her husband away from her and her children; another the person who has accused her of preparing poison for her husband; another devotes one who has not restored a borrowed garment, or has stolen a bracelet, or certain drinking-horns; and, from some instances, we might infer that this was a favourite place of worship for the poor and ignorant. In this living picture we find still lingering on, at the foot of the beautiful Greek marbles, that phase of religious temper which a cynical mind might think a truer link of its unity and permanence than any higher æsthetic instincts, a phase of it which the art of sculpture, humanising and refining man's conceptions of the unseen, tended constantly to do away. For the higher side of the Greek religion, thus humanised and refined by art, and elevated by it to the sense of beauty, is here also.

There were three ideal forms, as we saw, gradually shaping themselves in the development of the story of Demeter, waiting only for complete realisation at the hands of the sculptor; and now, with these forms in our minds, let us place ourselves in thought before the three images which once probably occupied, one of them being then wrought on a larger scale, the three niches or ambries in the face of that singular cliff at Cnidus. Of the three figures, one probably represents Persephone, as the goddess of the dead; the second, Demeter enthroned; the third is probably a portrait-statue of a priestess of Demeter, but may perhaps, even so, represent Demeter herself, Demeter *Achæa*, Ceres *Deserta*, the *mater dolorosa* of the Greeks, a type not as yet recognised in any other work of ancient art. Certainly it seems hard not to believe that this work is in some way connected with the legend of the place to which it belonged, and the main subject of which it realises so completely; and, at least, it shows how the higher Greek sculpture would have worked out this motive. If Demeter at all, it is Demeter the seeker, Δηώ, as she was called in the mysteries, in some pause of her restless wandering over the world in search of the lost child, and become at last an abstract type of the wanderer. The Homeric hymn, as we saw, had its sculptural motives, the great gestures of Demeter, who was ever the stately goddess, as she followed the daughters of Celeus, or sat by the well-side, or went out and in, through the halls of the palace, expressed in monumental words. With the sentiment of that monumental Homeric presence this statue is penetrated, uniting a certain solemnity of attitude and bearing, to a profound piteousness, an unrivalled pathos of expression. There is something of the pity of Michelangelo's *pietà*, in the wasted form and the marred countenance, yet with the light breaking faintly over it from the eyes, which, contrary to the usual practice in ancient sculpture, are represented as looking upwards. It is the aged woman who has escaped from pirates, who has but just escaped being sold as a slave, calling on the young for pity. The sorrows of her long wanderings seem to have passed into the marble; and in this too, it meets the demands which the reader of the Homeric hymn, with its command over the resources of human pathos, makes upon the sculptor. The tall figure, in proportion above the ordinary height, is veiled, and clad to the feet in the longer tunic, its numerous folds hanging in heavy parallel lines, opposing the lines of the peplos, or cloak which cross it diagonally over the breast, enwrapping the upper portion of the body somewhat closely. It is the very type of the wandering woman, going grandly indeed, as Homer describes her, yet so human in her anguish, that I seem to recognise some far descended shadow of her, in the homely figure of the roughly clad French peasant woman, who, in one of Corot's pictures, is hasting

along under a sad light, as the day goes out behind the little hill. We have watched the growth of the merely personal sentiment in the story; and we may notice that, if this figure be indeed Demeter, then the conception of her has become wholly humanised; no trace of the primitive import of the myth, no colour or scent of the mystical earth, remains about it.

The seated figure, much mutilated and worn by long exposure, yet possessing, according to the best critics, marks of the school of Praxiteles, is almost undoubtedly the image of Demeter enthroned. Three times in the Homeric hymn she is represented as sitting, once by the fountain at the wayside, again in the house of Celeus, and again in the newly finished temple of Eleusis; but always in sorrow; seated on the *πέτρα ἀγέλαστος*, which, as Ovid told us, the people of Attica still called *the stone of sorrow*. Here she is represented in her later state of reconciliation, enthroned as the glorified mother of all things. The delicate plaiting of the tunic about the throat, the formal curling of the hair, and a certain weight of over-thoughtfulness in the brows, recall the manner of Lïonardo, a master, one of whose characteristics is a very sensitive expression of the sentiment of maternity. I am reminded especially of a work by one of his scholars, the *Virgin of the Balances*, in the Louvre, a picture which has been thought to represent, under a veil, the blessing of universal nature, and in which the sleepy-looking heads, with a peculiar grace and refinement of somewhat advanced life in them, have just this half-weary posture. We see here, then, the Hera of the world below, the Stygian Juno, the chief of those Elysian matrons who come crowding, in the poem of Claudian, to the marriage toilet of Proserpine, the goddess of the fertility of the earth and of all creatures, but still of fertility as arisen out of death;¹ and therefore she is not without a certain pensiveness, having seen the seed fall into the ground and die, many times. Persephone has returned to her, and the hair spreads like a rich harvest over her shoulders; but she is still veiled, and knows that the seed must fall into the ground again, and Persephone descend again from her.

The statues of the supposed priestess, and of the enthroned Demeter, are of more than the size of life; the figure of Persephone is but seventeen inches high, a daintily handled toy of Parian marble, the miniature copy perhaps of a much larger work, which might well be reproduced on a magnified scale. The conception of Demeter is throughout chiefly human, and even domestic, though never without a hieratic interest, because she is not a goddess only, but also a priestess. In contrast, Persephone is wholly unearthly,

(1) "Pallere ligustra,
Exspirare rosas, decrescere lilia vidi."

the close companion, and even the confused double, of Hecate, the goddess of midnight terrors, *Despœna*, the final mistress of all that lives; and as sorrow is the characteristic sentiment of Demeter, so awe of Persephone. She is compact of sleep, and death, and flowers, but of narcotic flowers especially, a *revenant*, who in the garden of *Aidoneus* has eaten of the pomegranate, and bears always the secret of decay in her, in the mystery of its swallowed seeds; sometimes, in later work, holding in her hand the key of the great prison-house, but which unlocks all secrets also, there finally, or through oracles revealed in dreams; sometimes, like Demeter, the poppy, emblem of sleep and death by its narcotic juices, of life and resurrection by its innumerable seeds, of the dreams, therefore, that may intervene between falling asleep and waking. Treated as it is in the Homeric hymn, and still more in this statue, the image of Persephone may be regarded as the result of many efforts to lift the old Chthonian gloom, still living on in heavier souls, concerning the grave, to connect it with impressions of dignity and beauty, and a certain sweetness even: it is meant to make us in love, or at least at peace, with death. The Persephone of Praxiteles' school, then, is *Aphrodite-Persephone*, *Venus-Libitina*. Her shadowy eyes have gazed upon the fainter colouring of the under-world, and the tranquillity, born of it, has "passed into her face;" for the Greek Hades is, after all, but a quiet, twilight place, not very different from that *House of Fame* where Dante places the great souls of the classical world; *Aidoneus* himself being conceived in the highest Greek sculpture as but a gentler Zeus, the great innkeeper; so that when a certain Greek sculptor had failed in his portraiture of Zeus, because it had too little hilarity, too little in the eyes and brow of the open and cheerful sky, he only changed its title, and the thing passed excellently, with its heavy locks and shadowy eyebrows, for the god of the dead. The image of Persephone then, as it is here composed, with the tall tower-like head-dress, from which the veil depends—the corn-basket, originally carried thus by the Greek women, balanced on the head—giving the figure unusual length, has the air of a body bound about with grave-clothes; while the archaic hands and feet, and a certain stiffness in the folds of the drapery, give it something of a hieratic character, and to the modern observer may suggest a sort of kinship with the more chastened kind of Gothic work. But quite of the school of Praxiteles is the general character of the composition; the graceful waving of the hair, the fine shadows of the little face, of the eyes and lips especially, like the shadows of a flower—a flower risen noiselessly from its dwelling in the dust—though still with that fulness or heaviness in the brow, as of sleepy people, which, in the delicate gradations of Greek sculpture, distinguish the infernal deities from their Olympian kindred. The object placed in

the hand may be, perhaps, a stiff archaic flower, but is probably the partly consumed pomegranate, one morsel gone; the most usual emblem of Persephone being this mystical fruit, which, because of the multitude of its seeds, was to the Romans a symbol of fecundity, and was sold at the doors of the temples of Ceres, that the women might offer it there, and bear numerous children; and so, to the middle age, became a symbol of the fruitful earth itself; and then of that other seed sown in the dark under-world; and at last of that whole hidden region, so thickly sown, which Dante visited, Michelino painting him, in the *Duomo* of Florence, with this fruit in his hand, and Botticelli putting it into the childish hands of Him, who, if men "go down into hell, is there also."

There is an attractiveness in these goddesses of the earth akin to the influence of cool places, quiet houses, subdued light, tranquillising voices; for me, at least, I know it has been good to be with Demeter and Persephone, all the time I have been reading and thinking of them; and all through this essay, I have been asking myself, what is there in this phase of ancient religion for us at the present day? The myth of Demeter and Persephone, then, illustrates the power of the Greek religion as a religion of pure ideas, of conceptions, which having no link on historical fact, yet, because they arose naturally out of the spirit of man, and embodied, in adequate symbols, his deepest thoughts concerning the conditions of his physical and spiritual life, maintained their hold through many changes, and are still not without a solemnising power even for the modern mind, which has once admitted them as recognised and habitual inhabitants; and abiding thus for the elevation and purifying of our sentiments, long after the earlier and simpler races of their worshippers have passed away, they may be a pledge to us of the place in our culture, at once legitimate and possible, of the associations, the conceptions, the imagery, of Greek religious poetry in general, of the poetry of all religions.

WALTER H. PATER.

THE NEW JUDICATURE.

“ ——— cœnæ fercula nostræ
Malim convivis quam placuisse coquis.”

MARTIAL.

THE majority of those who are neither lawyers nor litigants will probably be as much surprised to learn that the benefits of a new Judicial System have been thrown open to them for the last three months, as M. Jourdain was at being told that he had been talking prose for forty years. The transition has been so quietly managed as to have been almost imperceptible to laymen not directly interested in it. There have been no processions, or banners, or stump-orations, or political blue-fire of any kind. Even the debates in Parliament on the Judicature Acts were very thinly attended, and, as a rule, were much too esoteric for ordinary members to join in them. No one who was present in Westminster Hall on the 2nd of last November, the inaugural day of the new Supreme Court, would have detected any difference between what took place then and what had taken place there, at the commencement of Michaelmas term, in any former year. The outward symbols were the same, even down to the gold lace and the ermine; and the judges, marching in the old order, were received with the old marks of popular favour. But the change is not the less great for having been so soberly effected, and, before the new order of things becomes stale, it may be worth while to endeavour to estimate its true value. I am aware that a practising lawyer is not always the fittest person to explain, much less to popularise, the law; for it is extremely difficult for him to extricate himself from the professional vortex in which he moves. It is therefore not without diffidence that I venture to undertake the task within the narrow limits of these pages; I do so, as is implied in my motto (which has a deep meaning for law reformers), in the interest of the general reader, and with the full consciousness that I have to steer clear of two rocks—those of prejudice and pedantry.

It is hardly necessary to recall the time when Jeremy Bentham exposed the evils attendant on the separation of our tribunals of law and equity, for there is no improvement, political or other, which has not been long familiar to the realm of philosophy before it emerges into the light of common day. The noticeable point is, that the separation of the tribunals should have been forcibly condemned by two Royal Commissions appointed in 1850 and 1851, twenty years before the first Judicature Bill was introduced into Parliament, and that a quarter of a century should have been allowed to pass by before their recommendations were carried into practical effect. The

Chancery Amendment Act 1852, and the Common Law Procedure Acts 1852 and 1854, the legislative outcome of these Commissions, were little else than codes of procedure applicable to the several Courts whence their titles were taken. The Chancery Amendment Act 1858, and Sir John Rolt's Act of 1862 were partial and fragmentary measures which, while inviting a closer comparison of the opposite systems in vogue at Westminster and Lincoln's Inn, served rather to deepen than to diminish the contrast between them. Although they gave full power to the Court of Chancery to work out justice to the end, in those cases where the suitor had rightly invoked its aid; in all other cases they left its doors closed against him, and notwithstanding the ruinous costs he might have incurred in preparing his cause for trial, he still had to seek the redress, which he was admittedly entitled to, by commencing fresh proceedings elsewhere. This was just as if a physician having undertaken to cut off a diseased limb should unexpectedly lay an artery bare, and then leave the patient to bleed to death on the plea that he was not a pure surgeon.

The Royal Commission of 1867 issued its first report in 1869, and on that report Lord Chancellor Hatherley founded his Judicature Bill of 1870. It is well known that Lord Hatherley's bill failed, but the reasons of its failure are not easy to discover. It attempted to consolidate all the superior courts into one new court, to which it gave the title of the Supreme Court of Judicature; but owing to some weakness in its framework, it was damaged by the criticism that the new tribunal was, after all, only the old courts under a new name, and that the consolidation was more nominal than real. It had another defect which ought not to have been fatal, and in fact might have been easily remedied: it was wholly silent as to the course of procedure which the new Supreme Court should adopt, that being left, according to Lord Hatherley's first proposal, to be settled by a committee of judges, and by a committee of the Privy Council according to his second. On these two blots Lord Westbury lavished his withering sarcasm in the House of Lords, while the Lord Chief Justice of England, for reasons that need not be gone into here, denounced the proposed changes to the outside world in a scathing letter to the Lord Chancellor, which had in it the ring of the days of Ellesmere and Coke. The Bill of 1870 went down to the Commons; but it was proceeded with no further, and was not even re-introduced in 1871, although Lord Hatherley still held the seals. And the practitioners in the Courts, who had been much exercised in their minds as to their professional prospects in the event of the bill becoming law, had rest two whole years.

In November, 1872, on the retirement of Lord Hatherley, Sir Roundell Palmer became Lord Chancellor, and to his lot it fell—it

could not have fallen more appropriately to the lot of any man—to introduce in the ensuing session of Parliament a measure embodying the main recommendations of the Commission of 1867, of which he had been the prime mover. It is said that the draft of this measure, which ultimately became ‘The Judicature Act, 1873,’ was entirely the work of Lord Selborne’s own hand, and the masterly way in which it dealt with the subject furnishes a strong presumption of the truth of the rumour. Lord Selborne’s bill was free from the faults which had proved so disastrous to his immediate predecessor; it effectually consolidated the superior Courts into one, without disturbing the settled channels of business more than was absolutely necessary; it expressly declared the supremacy of the principles of equity, where they were in conflict with those of the Common Law, so as to prevent any future collision between them; and it prescribed a code of rules, founded on a simple and rational basis, for the practical guidance of the tribunal that it called into existence. The one point of attack that it presented was, that it proposed to abolish, once and for all, the judicial functions of the House of Lords, and to transfer them to a new Court of Appeal. It was found easy in certain quarters to turn this proposal into a political challenge, and to make it subserve party purposes, and so Lord Selborne’s bill, although it received the royal assent in August, 1873, was suspended in its operation until November, 1874, and was again suspended until November, 1875. The country has reason to congratulate itself that these suspensions took place, for in the interval Lord Selborne’s rules were expanded into a more complete code of procedure, prepared with the sanction of a select committee of judges, and dealing in an exhaustive manner with the various points likely to arise in practice.* Last year it was the good fortune of Lord Cairns to place the coping stone on the new judicial edifice, by passing a supplemental Judicature Act, known as “The Judicature Act, 1875,” and containing, among other minor improvements, this amended code of procedure. At the same time he silenced further opposition in Parliament, by prolonging the continuance of the judicial power of the House of Peers until November, 1876; and the country will have shortly to determine whether there is to be any further respite. By the Act of 1875, the Tories took up and carried forward the work of their political opponents, who had thoroughly manured and tilled the ground, but there was no attendant party triumph to recall the adroitness with which some years before they had contrived to ‘dish the Whigs’ by outbidding them on the electoral question. The Acts of 1873 and 1875 make up between them one solid and consistent whole; and while the impartial historian will acknowledge the special services of their individual framers, he will divide the honours

between the two powers in the State without seeking to award the palm to either.

Before inquiring what the Judicature Acts have done for us, let us consider for a moment what it is they have not done. They have not brought about, nor were they intended to bring about, what is popularly termed a 'fusion of law and equity.' To have done this would have been to abolish trusts, and without trusts it would be impossible to adapt the devolution of property to the exigencies of modern civilised life. Every settlement of land or stock, and every disposition under which a married woman is protected against the extravagance or bankruptcy of her husband, avails itself of the machinery of trusts; and no system of registration of titles that has yet been devised ventures altogether to dispense with trusts. The distinction between the legal and the equitable ownership is, in these cases, perfectly natural, and is to be found in nearly all systems of jurisprudence that are worthy of the name. The special vice of the English system has been that this distinction was extended to cases where it was no longer natural, but on the contrary thoroughly artificial and irreconcilable with common sense. It was unnatural that a legal estate should become extinguished by union with another and greater legal estate, while no such extinction took place if both the estates were equitable only, or one was equitable and the other legal. It was unnatural that an assignment of a bond or other debt should be recognised in a Court of Equity, but not recognised in a Court of Common Law. It was unnatural that time should be of the essence of a contract if sued on at Westminster Hall, but not of the essence of the same contract if sued on at Lincoln's Inn; or that a tenant for life, under no legal restraint with regard to waste, should not be liable in damages for maliciously cutting down an ornamental avenue of trees, though, in equity, he might be prevented from lopping a single bough, if an injunction were applied for before the mischief was done. To these and other absurd refinements of the same kind, the Judicature Acts have put an end, but they have still left a clear domain of equity, separate and distinct from that of law, namely, the domain of trusts. In a word, they have not effected fusion, but they have effected concurrent administration. The terms 'law' and 'equity' will, however, be no longer used, as they have hitherto been, in opposition to each other, and the latter term will probably cease to be used at all, except in connection with the equitable estate. This will be owing to the fact that in both sections of the Supreme Court, namely, the High Court of Justice and the Court of Appeal, there is henceforth but a single set of ruling principles, and that in these Courts, for all administrative purposes, equity and law are one.

Equity and law are one under the Judicature Acts, but are they

one at the expense of law or at the expense of equity? The language of the Acts is plain that equity is to prevail, but what if those who administer law are not familiar with the equity that overrides it? While the Bill of 1873 was passing through Parliament these questions were repeated in various forms, and caused such nervous apprehension in the minds of practitioners in the Court of Chancery as ultimately to induce them to present a remonstrance to the Lord Chancellor. The *Saturday Review*, in one of a series of articles which have since been republished,¹ expressed itself in the same key: "Our complaint of the Bill is that it destroys and does not construct, that it abolishes the old safeguards, rude, no doubt, but still efficient, without substituting any other safeguards to protect the highest portion of our law from gradual but certain deterioration." In fact it seems to have been thought that when the Court of Chancery was no more, the principles that had taken root there would die under transplantation, and that Lord Selborne having climbed to the summit of his ambition with the help of the ladder of equity was about to kick the ladder down on the pretence of making concessions to the common lawyers. These dismal forebodings were in great measure dispelled by Lord Selborne's speech on the third reading of his bill, and have been completely falsified by the experience of the last three months. Those who gave them utterance did not sufficiently foresee or consider (1) that business would, at the commencement of the transition period, follow its ancient lines, and that actions involving points of equity would not, as a rule, be set down for trial in those divisions of the High Court in which Common Law judges preside; (2) that the new system provides for and encourages a free interchange of judges between the different divisions; and (3) that the doctrines of equity are not after all so recondite and abstruse that they cannot be grasped by a judge of ability, assisted by a competent bar, whatever his early training may have been. It was a surprise to the profession when Sir George Mellish, an eminent Common Law advocate, was appointed a Lord Justice of the Court of Appeal in Chancery, but the appointment was a signal success, and no one ever suggested that equitable principles suffered at his hands. It was a greater surprise still when Mr. Baron Bramwell and Mr. Justice Brett, two ordinary judges of the old Common Law Courts, and therefore supposed to have no knowledge of equity, were lately summoned to assist at the deliberations of the new Court of Appeal, and to rehear cases decided by the Master of the Rolls and the Vice Chancellors; but here, again, the selection has been amply justified by the result. Without enumerating other instances in which eminent lawyers now living are doing good judicial work in a sphere not naturally their own, it will suffice to say that

(1) "Thoughts on Fusion of Law and Equity." By G. W. Hemming, Q.C.

the late Lord Cranworth was all the greater equity judge for having been also Baron of the Exchequer, and that Lord Eldon himself was Chief Justice of the Common Pleas before he presided with such extraordinary power and learning over the old Court of Chancery.

There is one other change in the organic judicial structure which it will be convenient to notice here, namely, the abolition of the Court of Exchequer Chamber. The composition of that Court of intermediate appeal was, at all events in modern times, highly unsatisfactory. Its original design was, that the decision of the Court below, on the legal points reserved at the first trial, should be reviewed by the entire body of Common Law judges, excluding only those who had been present at the previous hearing. When the Court, so formed, was a full one, and unanimous, its judgments carried with them very considerable weight. But, in practice, the Court seldom comprised more than five or six members, and this combination was based upon convenience rather than upon special fitness. The result was that a strong judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench, consisting perhaps of some five judges, was liable to be reversed in the Exchequer Chamber by a majority of three judges over two, chosen at random from the Common Pleas and the Exchequer, and similarly the Exchequer judges were liable to be overruled by a narrow majority of the Queen's Bench and Common Pleas. Such a system of compensation, however fair and even as between the judges, who alternately lost and won by the arrangement, could not commend itself to the unfortunate suitor with but a single cause to be tried. The special, if not the only, advantage of this ingenious contrivance was, that it saved the salaries of extra appellate judges; its disadvantages were, that it unsettled instead of settling the law, caused disappointment and vexation to the litigant, and, by taking too many of the judges of first instance away from their proper work, delayed the progress of public business. It is unlikely that, amongst the most bigoted worshippers of our constitutional forms, any one will be found to drop a tear over the extinction of the Exchequer Chamber, and its merger in the new Court of Appeal.

It would not be fitting to attempt, in these pages, to describe minutely the practice of the new Judicature, or to dwell at length on its superiority over the system it has superseded. To do this would necessitate the use of professional terms, which I desire as far as possible to avoid, and would require a far larger measure of space than I could venture to occupy. I shall, therefore, only touch lightly on four salient points; (1) the new mode of commencing an action; (2) the new pleadings or methods of determining what are the real issues between the parties; (3) the evidence by which those issues may be supported; (4) the several forms of trial.

I. All 'actions' (and there are no longer any 'suits') are now commenced by a writ of summons, which is required to state in a few simple words, for the information of the opposite party, what is the nature of the complaint made, or relief sought, against him. This is at once an innovation upon the more recent practice and a partial restitution of an older order of things. Four-and-twenty years ago the initiatory writ at law was bound to declare, though it often did so in language nearly unintelligible, the nature of the redress asked for, the reason of this rule being that there were only fixed forms of writs, and those limited in number, within one or other of which the plaintiff's grievance must be brought, or he could not sue at all. In order to obviate this injustice, and with it to get rid of a good deal of absurd jargon that so darkened the threshold of the dispute as to prevent the plaintiff from clearly seeing his way into it, or the defendant from finding his way out, the Common Law Procedure Act, 1852, allowed writs to be issued without a word of explanation as to what the party issuing them really wanted. The intention was good, namely, to make the system more elastic, but the effort to be brief rendered the cause of action obscure. The practice of the Court of Chancery was open to still graver objections, for there the plaintiff's first step was to serve his opponent with a more or less prolix document called a 'bill,' and, if the case was one for an immediate injunction, to follow the bill up by another document almost precisely in the same words, called an 'affidavit in support.' Thus the defendant, even if willing to confess himself in the wrong, had no opportunity of striking his colours except at the risk of having to pay a large sum for costs, and many a suit commenced in this way has been continued for the purpose of adjusting the burden of the costs, long after the subject matter had ceased to exist. The framers of the new code of procedure, profiting by the experience that nearly 70 per cent. of the litigation in England (I advisedly say nothing of Scotland or Wales) is amicably arranged almost as soon as it is commenced, have steered a middle course between these opposite extremes, and have wisely prescribed that the nature of the claim to be made, and of the relief or remedy demanded, shall be clearly and concisely indorsed on the writ of summons, without requiring that it shall be cast in any stereotyped mould.

II. After the writ of summons come the pleadings. And here we approach what was once a great mystery, almost as great as that in which the patrician order at Rome enveloped the *formule* of actions until they were divulged by the theft of the scribe Flavius. Obviously the best system of pleading is that which elicits, in the shortest and most convenient form, the material issues of fact to which the law has to be applied, and thus puts each party in complete possession of the

points to which his evidence should be addressed. Any method that stops short of this enables one party to spring a surprise on the other at the trial, and any method that goes beyond it cumbers the record with irrelevant matter. In either case there is risk of a miscarriage of justice: in the first, because the party surprised may be unable, for want of preparation, to parry his adversary's attack; in the second, because juries are apt to lose sight of the real issue when false or collateral issues are presented along with it. The old common lawyers were so impressed with the first half of these truths, that they entirely forgot the second half; and the art of special pleading seems to have been invented expressly for the purpose of widening the area of dispute, instead of confining it within its proper bounds. As children are given fragments of coloured glass in a kaleidoscope, out of which they make new combinations by turning it round, so the special pleaders, taking to pieces a simple money transaction, and resolving it into all its possible elements, presented it to view in a distracting variety of shapes under the denomination of 'common counts.' These common counts, originating with the plaintiff, gave rise to as many different 'pleas' on the part of the defendant; and thus, if one may be allowed a sudden change of metaphor, an intricate web was spun, by the ingenuity of the lawyers, in which the client would have failed to recognise a single thread of his own, if he had taken the trouble to look into it. For a long time, too, neither party could enforce, at Common Law, admissions from his opponent, but was forced to resort for them to the Court of Chancery, where they were indigenous to the soil. It is true that in 1854 interrogatories were allowed to be administered with the leave of the Common Law judge, but the innovation was hampered with inconvenient restrictions, and was after all but an imperfect engine of discovery. To borrow a comparison from the able writer already referred to,¹ an action at law was carried on much on the same principle as a game of whist, where each side does his best to conceal his hand from the other, whilst a suit in equity was managed like a game of chess, or, if you will, whist with double dummy. There can be little doubt that, as a means of shortening litigation, by informing each party beforehand of the strength and weakness of his adversary's case, the Equity method of pleading was the superior; but it had the great defect of suffering what was technically called the 'discovery' to be mixed up and entangled with the 'defence,' and both to be presented together in a single document called the 'answer.' The new Rules of Procedure have untied this knot—a knot which the skilful draftsman strove to make as tight as possible—and discovery and defence are now kept apart from each other, while the pleading on both sides

(1) *Quarterly Review*, Jan., 1876; "Judicial Investigation of Truth."

is reduced to a simple narrative of facts, concluding with the claim for the particular remedy to which the party speaking considers himself entitled. Ample opportunity is afforded for amendment, both before and at the trial, when the justice of the case demands it, and the plaintiff is allowed the last word; but unless fresh ground has been broken by the defendant, and made the foundation of a counter-claim, that word is merely of a formal character, and, when uttered, closes the pleadings.

III. As the end of good pleading is to bring out the points of agreement and difference, and thereby to narrow the controversy, so the end of a fair trial is to determine, by proper evidence, on which side the truth lies. If it had been asked under the old *régime* what was *proper evidence*—meaning thereby evidence furnished by human testimony, as distinguished from that furnished by documents—the answer to the question would have depended on the Court in which it was put. The reply in the late Court of Chancery would have been, that evidence was proper if contained in the affidavit of some person conversant with the facts deposed to, provided only that the deposition was in other respects receivable, and that there had been an opportunity of cross-examining upon it. In a Court of Common Law we should have been told, that such affidavit evidence was very nearly worthless, and that the only proper mode of proceeding was to put the witness into the box, and get him to tell his story first-hand, in the presence of the judge and jury, who could observe his demeanour, and draw their conclusions from it. The latter answer is plainly the more correct of the two, and no one familiar with the practice of the Court of Chancery will deny that the system of evidence countenanced there was about as bad as it could be. In that Court, oral examination in chief before the Court itself was almost unknown, although, owing to certain modern Acts of Parliament, it was not wholly excluded; and cross-examination, even in hostile cases, could not, until quite recent times, be conducted under the eye of the Chancery judge who had to decide the cause. By a general order of Court of the year 1861, when either party desired to cross-examine a witness, the party, whose witness he was, was required to produce him for that purpose at the trial; but this order only applied to a limited class of suits, and left it optional to a plaintiff, by proceeding in a particular manner, technically called ‘moving for a decree,’ to screen all his witnesses from judicial scrutiny, and to force the cause on for trial, supported by printed or written evidence only. In the hands of an unscrupulous litigant, this worked considerable mischief, for it was often easy to manufacture an affidavit or deposition that would stand the test even of severe cross-examination when the result only appeared on paper. To reproduce the unwillingness and the hesitation of a witness is not possible

to a shorthand writer, and it was certainly never attempted by either of the two amiable gentlemen before whom, as the official examiners of the Court, Chancery cross-examinations had to be conducted. Then again, even when the witnesses were honest, their affidavits often disguised, if they did not pervert the facts, owing to the mode of their production. An attorney's clerk would be sent down to an illiterate man or woman to ascertain what they knew of this or that matter, and, as a consequence of the interview, a string of statements would be jotted down more or less relevant to the questions to be tried. These statements would then be transcribed and submitted to counsel, with instructions to turn them into an affidavit, and this he did by bringing out prominently all the favourable portions of them, and throwing all the unfavourable ones into the background. Not unfrequently he would make a suggestion that possibly the witness would be able to depose to some further fact bearing on the case, which appeared to him to have been forgotten, and he appended provisionally another sentence or two, with the remark that the witness should be seen again, and that, if true, it should be introduced into his deposition. It was commonly found that human nature was too weak to resist so powerful a temptation, and that if the witness's memory was not really quickened by the suggestion, he managed to persuade himself that it was. The opposing counsel, having no means of judging from perusal of the completed document what was within the certain knowledge of the deponent, and what was merely his hazy recollection or belief, often abstained from cross-examining on this interpolated matter, lest the answer should strengthen his adversary's case. It may be added that the witness, having usually got his affidavit by heart before he came up for cross-examination, would probably not have been substantially shaken if the experiment had been tried. In not a few instances—though the practice was never approved of—affidavits have been prepared without any sufficient materials, on the chance that the witness would "swear up to the mark;" and it being notorious that prosecutions for perjury, even where directed by a judge, very rarely end in a verdict of guilty, the mark has been often sworn up to accordingly. In non-contested cases, or where the parties agree to it, there can of course be no objection to affidavit evidence; and therefore the Judicature Act provides that, under those conditions, it may be resorted to. Thus, all that is good in the Chancery system is preserved, while much useless expense is saved, by its being no longer imperative on the suitor, as it formerly was at Common Law, to summon his witnesses from a distance to prove facts lying outside the field of actual contest.

IV. It remains to say a few words on the several forms of trial. These are now considerably multiplied so as to be capable of easy adaptation to almost any phase of the litigation. The Acts carefully

preserve the right of every litigant to have his cause submitted, as a whole, by the judge to the jury, with a proper and complete direction both as to the law and the evidence ; but at the same time they recognise the truth that there are many subsidiary parts of a case that cannot be conveniently dealt with in this old constitutional fashion. Not only are there questions of law which have to be disengaged from the facts and first determined by the judge ; but there are many questions of fact which are not proper to be submitted to a jury at all. For example the facts, and the conclusions to be drawn from them, may hinge, not on actual events or phenomena falling within the range of the senses, but on a general course of mercantile dealing, or the special usage of a trade ; and then they cannot well be determined without a knowledge of that course of dealing, or the usage of that particular trade. Sometimes they involve complicated inquiries into mere matters of account, and it is easy to see that in these and like instances, to bring into play the machinery of a judge and jury would be a useless waste of public time. Under the old system, there were many contrivances for disposing of this class of questions, and each Court adopted that one which seemed right in its own eyes. In the Court of Chancery, matters of account were referred to the judge at chambers, that is, practically to the chief clerk ; in the Courts of Common Law, references went to the master, or, where the parties so agreed, to private arbitration, the arbitrator being usually a barrister, or a lay expert whose ignorance of law was supposed to be counterbalanced by his special knowledge on other points. It would be difficult to exaggerate the inconveniences with which this last kind of reference was attended. In the first place arbitration was seldom resorted to until the trial had actually commenced and all the costs of it had been incurred, including even the fee on the counsel's brief. Towards the end of an assize, it was not uncommon to see a dozen heavy actions so dealt with, to the surprise of no one engaged in them except the parties themselves, who naturally failed to comprehend why their cases were so summarily shunted. It is to be hoped they abstained from following them further, for what with adjournments to suit everybody's convenience, half or quarter days of work, documents and witnesses not forthcoming when wanted, and a hundred other irregularities, due to the absence of judicial control and the wholesome check of public opinion, these arbitrations, when they once began, threatened never to come to an end. The result was an enormous increase of costs, to say nothing of risk of miscarriage in the award, and if miscarriage there were, it was irretrievable ; for an award does not admit of an appeal, unless there is error on the face of it, or the arbitrator has been guilty of personal misconduct. The Judicature Acts have not abrogated these references to arbitrations, but have

placed them on a higher platform, by calling into existence a new class of functionaries called Official Referees, who are directed to hold their sittings *de die in diem*, and are clothed with all the authority of judges of the High Court, except the power of committal to prison. The Official Referee is not bound, as the private arbitrator was, to complete the Reference as a whole, irrespective of the difficulties that may have arisen in the course of it; but he is at liberty to break it off and submit any incidental question for the decision of the Court, or to state any facts specially, in order that the Court may draw its own inferences from them. The Court may also require any explanation or reasons from the referee, and remit to him the whole, or any part, of his 'findings' for reconsideration and revision. Should the parties prefer it, they may choose their own referee, and so withdraw themselves from the jurisdiction of the permanent officer; the person so agreed on (called a special referee) being invested by the Acts with all the powers and duties of the official referee.

There is one other office created by the Acts in connection with the Supreme Court which has hitherto been only known in connection with the Admiralty and the County Courts, namely, the office of Assessor. Whenever a reference was made to the Registrar of the Court of Admiralty, he had power to call in competent merchants and other skilled persons to assist him in the inquiry; and when, in the year 1868, a limited Admiralty jurisdiction was conferred on certain County Courts, the judges of those Courts were authorised to summon to their aid nautical persons acquainted with maritime subjects. In the following year, by an amending Act, the County Court judges were empowered to call in mercantile assessors; but owing to this Act having been framed under a misconception, the power has been very sparingly, if ever, exercised. It is by no means clear as yet what will be the precise functions of the assessors of the Supreme Court, or how they will be selected, the rules of procedure being silent on these points; but their business will be not only to assist the judges, when required, but the referees also, whether official or special; and the remuneration, both of referees and assessors, is to be determined by the Court employing them. Both classes of officers have been long known on the Continent, referees or experts for the investigation of special facts being distinctly recognised by the Hamburg law, and commercial assessors having been established at Frankfort many years before it ceased to be a free state.

There is still another important provision of the new Acts which may appropriately be noticed here, viz., the formation of district registries in immediate connection with the Supreme Court. It was unquestionably a hardship to compel all actions which did not fall

within the County Court jurisdiction to be commenced in London, when both parties were residing or carrying on business in the same country town. For the mechanical process of issuing the writ, or of entering up judgment in default of the appearance of the defendant, a local office, where the proceedings can be recorded, is obviously as good as a London one, and it is very much cheaper. Hitherto every country solicitor has had a London agent by whom all his business in the superior Courts has been transacted, and who has shared the clients' fees with him. Large fortunes have been accumulated by many a metropolitan firm whose principal employment has been that of an intermediary only; and, in former times, the support of what was called a large agency house has been the making of many a barrister, and has accelerated his promotion to the bench. Business is now dispersed through a greater number of channels, so that the old professional monopolies no longer assume such gigantic proportions. The establishment of district registries will, though not to any very considerable extent, further curtail the employment of these agents; but if there is to be uniformity in the law, and a great and central bar, it would be impossible wholly to dispense with them, and we must become thoroughly disintegrated and provincialised before they cease to exist. The Judicature Acts have, in this respect, been very cautiously and discreetly framed. When either of the parties resides outside the limited area prescribed by the Acts, the proceedings, down to notice of trial, can only go on within that area with the consent of both litigants; and even when both reside within the same area, there are great facilities for removing the action to London, if a judge should think fit so to order. Except that local venues are abolished, the trial of the action will, for the most part, take place where it took place before, without reference to the district registry in which the preliminary proceedings have been had.

Disguise the fact as we Londoners may, it is obvious that there is a powerful body of persons at work who are striving to break up our judicial framework, and to decentralise the legal profession, under the plausible plea that law should be cheap, and should be administered near every man's door. Those who are of this opinion are apt to forget that cheap law encourages litigation, and that when law is home-made its quality is seldom first-rate. It is natural that localised judges and provincial solicitors should persuade themselves that the County Courts might be made legal centres for commercial administration, and that he who can be entrusted to decide a dispute involving fifty pounds can, as safely, be trusted to decide upon thousands. But is the country prepared to have its large commercial questions decided in a dozen different ways by a dozen different tribunals? All law is bad that is uncertain, or rather

uncertain law is no law; and without a controlling power and the fittest intellects to wield it, our law, which for want of a code is already obscure enough, would soon become a chaos. The integrity of our judges is beyond suspicion, but if they were all fixed in certain spots, and attended by local barristers and solicitors only, who can say what influences might not be brought to bear upon them—influences which they themselves would not be conscious of, just as the weakest of them are not conscious now of the spell that an able advocate, with whose manner and tone they have become pleasantly familiar, succeeds in weaving around them? The conception of English Law as the image of Justice is dear to the hearts of the bulk of the people of England; and the embodiment of that conception, whether viewed from its civil or its criminal side, should have something of majesty about it.

The introduction into our legal system of the several new elements already indicated; the facilities now given for joining together several causes of action and for admitting counter-claims; the power conferred on the judges to settle issues, where not clearly defined by the parties themselves; the extension of the special indorsement on the writ which has been found so useful for bills of exchange; in a word, the equipping of every division of the High Court with all the judicial appliances that have proved valuable anywhere, will, it is hoped, pacify those members of the community who have for some time past been clamouring for tribunals of commerce, including even Mr. Ayrton, who stands at their head. Judging from the evidence taken before the Select Committee of the House of Commons, which reported in 1871, Mr. Ayrton and his mercantile friends are not yet agreed amongst themselves as to the composition of the tribunals that they are prepared to recommend, or the class of cases that should come before them. They are not agreed whether the judges should be wholly commercial, as in France and Belgium, or partly commercial and partly legal, as in many of the German states; whether the commercial members should be paid or not for their services, whether the tribunals should be exclusive of, or concurrent with, that of the superior Courts, whether they should be bound by the settled rules of evidence, or should admit as evidence whatever appears to them to be material, whether there should or should not be an appeal to a regularly constituted legal Court. For example, amongst the witnesses examined, Mr. Morris, the President of the Halifax Chamber of Commerce, stated that he should personally prefer that the new tribunal should be on a purely voluntary footing, like the Committee of the Stock Exchange or Lloyds, "thus offering to litigants the power of escaping litigation "by referring it to men honest and anxious to come to a speedy "opinion, with their knowledge derived from a fellow feeling with

"the two parties." The Chairman of the Bradford Chamber differed *in toto* from Mr. Morris, and, so far from wishing to use the new Courts merely as instruments of voluntary arbitration, desired that they should be complete Courts of first instance, with exclusive and compulsory jurisdiction, though liable to be appealed from on purely legal questions. In fact, he wished for an extension of the existing County Courts with a special commercial department superadded, that should be unfettered by any pecuniary limit. Other witnesses were for making the jurisdiction compulsory, but only in the case where one of the parties insisted on it, leaving it optional to them to have the cause tried by the Superior Court, if both were willing to indulge in the luxury. And so throughout the entire blue book, *quot homines tot sententie*. How the Committee managed, in face of this evidence, to issue an unanimous report, it is difficult to understand; and their final proposal to appoint "commercial judges whose office, like that of a justice of the peace, should be regarded as an honourable duty, not as a service of emolument" does not strike one as very practical, or consistent with our experience of the requirements of business men. Most law reformers of the present day are endeavouring to get rid of our one unpaid magistracy, that composed of clergymen and country squires, and to attempt to establish another of a wholly commercial character appears to be little short of preposterous.

It must not be inferred from what has been said that the new system is without blemishes, or that it will not require careful handling to insure its working smoothly. Already some of the rules of procedure have failed to stand the criticism brought to bear upon them, but no flaw has yet been discovered that cannot be easily repaired. One thing seems likely, that the existing staff of judges will prove inadequate to the task that they are required to get through, and this more especially in the Chancery Division, where the greater part of the evidence has now to be taken *voir dire* in open court. Some of the Common Law judges (I use the term for convenience merely) are already beginning to complain of the excessive friction that attends their labours under the Acts, and of the diversified parts that they are called upon to fill at the shortest possible notice. But friction is an accompaniment of all new machinery, and every fresh experience on the bench increases the power of those who preside there, and adds to the confidence which they inspire. It can, however, be hardly necessary that so much continuous exertion should be required of the judges as is involved in their having to endure a sitting, like that now in progress, of thirteen weeks without a break. Few minds are strong enough to bear so severe a strain, and, unless both bench and bar are in full vigour, business may go on but it does not progress. Any one who has had practical

experience of our Courts knows how the trial of a heavy cause may be reduced within a comparatively narrow compass when the judge, before whom it is opened, has a rapid perception of the real points on which it turns, and how the speeches of counsel and evidence of witnesses may be curtailed by a timely intimation from the Court of what is, and what is not, relevant matter. If all sittings are to be as protracted as that which commenced on the 11th of last month, one of two things must happen; either we must have more judges, or public business will begin to drag and the quality of the work of the Judicial Bench will, with rare exceptions, deteriorate.

These difficulties may be easily arranged, as involving no important principle; but there are two other questions of greater moment, intimately connected with our Judicature, to which Parliament will have to address itself early in the ensuing session. The first of these—the appointment of one or more Public Prosecutors—has been agitated for upwards of twenty years, and has been the subject of no less than five abortive bills, the last of which was introduced into the House of Commons by Mr. Bruce in 1873, and was withdrawn for want of time to proceed with it effectually. Every one is agreed that, when a crime has been committed, it ought not to be left to the individual injured to bring the criminal to justice; not only because a crime is an offence against the State, but because a State which declines to interfere by prosecuting criminals to conviction cannot adequately discharge its duty as protector of the lives and properties of its subjects. So long as the prosecution of offenders is left in private hands, crimes which ought to be severely punished are likely to be condoned, and the condonation of a crime often acts as an encouragement to the criminal to repeat his former experiment on a larger scale. Even when a private citizen takes the trouble to put the law in motion, although he may have nothing to gain by it, his prosecution often fails for want of adequate funds, or defective knowledge either on his own part, or on the part of those he employs. In civil causes this is inevitable, for we are all liable to disappointments, owing to the carelessness or incompetency of our agents; but the State has a right to be served efficiently, and by the prizes it is able to offer can always insure that it shall be. At present the duty of getting up prosecutions is, in the first instance, entrusted to the police, and they it is who communicate with the witnesses, and put the evidence into shape. It is no disparagement to them to say that they do this part of their work only too well, and that innocent men have sometimes suffered from their *trop de zèle*. Moreover, the police are not infrequently the most important witnesses at the trial, and a prosecutor who is also a witness is apt to be biased, even when he desires to be honest. It is a mere accident that the committing magistrates' clerks also act as

public prosecutors up to a certain point. Their services in that capacity are occasional merely, and very ill-requested, and there have been many cases of importance in which they have failed to instruct counsel for the prosecution at the assizes, because it was not worth their while to prepare his brief or advance his fee.

The only instances of State prosecutions arising out of private injuries occur when, as in a late celebrated case turning wholly on circumstantial evidence, the Government interferes on account of their peculiar gravity, and then the action of the Government is determined by popular rumour, rather than by legal authority, and is wholly dependent on the will of the Lords of the Treasury. There is no danger in England of our public prosecutors becoming invested with inquisitorial powers, like those of the *ministère public* in France, or of their modelling their indictments on the French *actes d'accusation*, which not only recapitulate all the grounds from which the guilt of the accused may be inferred, but also refute by anticipation the arguments for the defence. The difficulty of the measure lies, not in its principle, but in its administrative details, and it is, therefore, exactly the kind of problem which the Conservatives undertook to solve when they last came into office.

The other question which must be discussed next session, and finally disposed of, is the question whether there is to be a second appeal in civil cases, and what the nature of that appeal is to be. The House of Lords, unless willing to submit to reform, can hardly maintain its ground, as the tribunal of ultimate resort, beyond the autumn of this year; for at present it is disfigured by shams, and we are fast learning to exchange shams for realities. That there should be an opportunity for a second appeal, I, for one, sincerely believe; but half the value of the appeal is thrown away if the judgment delivered gives forth an uncertain sound. That half-a-dozen law-peers should pretend to be the House of Lords, and that we should all agree to call them so, is plainly contrary to common sense; that, being all of them ex-judges, except the one who for the time being is the Chief Judge of the land, they should deliver their judgments in the deliberative, instead of the judicial style, would be intolerable but that the singularity of the form is usually redeemed by the broad wisdom that pervades and animates the substance. The mischief of these so-called *speeches* is, that those uttered by the minority get cited as authorities, as well as those uttered by the majority, though, in fact, neither the one nor the other are commanding expositions of the law, nor, except so far as they lead up directly to the final decision, are they binding on the subordinate courts. Differences of opinion often exist amongst the members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and these differences find free expression in the course of the cases heard before them, but the judg-

ment delivered is as the voice of one man, and not a discordant note is heard in it. If the rule were otherwise, these imperial appeals would soon cease to satisfy our colonies and dependencies, as happily they now do; just as any other manifesto of the Crown, if it bore the marks of indecision, would inevitably breed disaffection and distrust. It was right that the members of the old Exchequer Chamber should openly state their individual conclusions, and even reply upon one another in the course of delivering judgment; for the benefit of the discussion would have been lost if these conclusions had not been put in a shape in which they could be reviewed by the Court above. But the strength of the House of Lords, as a Court of ultimate appeal, is seriously impaired by the public exhibition of divided and distracted counsels; and it is peculiarly illogical that the members of such a Court should be openly arrayed against each other, when the theory is that they are bound by all the decisions of their predecessors, and that their own decisions are in their turn infallible, and can only be altered by the intervention of the entire body of the legislature. It is a minor grievance that the House of Lords is not accessible during the prorogation of Parliament, for the judicial arrears there are never very considerable; but whilst we are promoting, by every means in our power, the dispatch of business in the superior Courts, it is an anomaly to brook delay in the highest Court of all. As a second legislative chamber the House of Lords is of immense and increasing value to the State; but its present judicial position is a mere 'survival' of past ages, and adds nothing to its dignity or its permanence. It has been frequently admonished that this excrescence must be pared away, or made conformable to modern requirements; the time has fully come for it to show how far it has profited by the warning.

MONTAGUE COOKSON.

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE past month has brought no modification in the state of the East. Austria persists with admirable patience in trying to untie the Gordian knot which no one dares to propose to cut. At St. Petersburg, Vienna, and Constantinople, however, they are simply marking time: everybody is excessively vigilant and rather distrustful. Count Andrassy's Note on the reforms which ought to be required from the Porte has travelled very slowly, only reaching its destination a fortnight after beginning its journey. It has been duly examined by the cabinets. Russia, Prussia, France, and Italy all approve it. England after some hesitation also supports it, because her abstention would encourage inopportune resistance in Turkey. The difficulty of course is not to trace a programme, but to assure its execution. For this, as everybody sees, the intervention of the great powers, under one form or another, is indispensable. But what form of intervention will be really efficacious, and at the same time such as Turkey can accept?

Even Lord Stratford de Redcliffe admits that the execution of the reforms should be superintended by a commission composed of the representatives of the great powers. But would this be enough? Two difficulties present themselves at the first glance. In a commission containing persons with different, or hostile interests, agreement in action is not easy; it is only to be secured by abstaining from action. Moreover, the iniquities which are to be brought to an end, are perpetrated in remote districts where the government of Constantinople itself has little means of exerting effective pressure. For some time past circumstances have been remarked on all sides that unmistakably indicate a complete disorganization of the body politic. In Roumelia and Bulgaria, though these are not insurgent provinces, bands of Turks, often of Bashi-Bazouks, make their way into the farmsteads, outrage the women, carry off all that is worth taking, and slay or burn the unhappy peasants. Atrocities of the same sort are committed even at the very doors of Constantinople. When soldiers who represent the government, thus set an example of pillage and assassination, what means has authority got left for restoring order? In vain you decree the equality of Christians and Mussulmans. It will be a dead letter. Those who are best informed declare positively that such reforms will never be put into practice or respected, until they are imposed by an iron hand. Just in proportion as the poverty of the Treasury grows worse, will the disorganization grow more general. The officials, no longer drawing their salaries regularly, will no longer fulfil their duties. The soldiers, no longer receiving their pay, will plunder the rayahs, like the lanzknechts of the middle ages. The provincial governors, to obtain a greater return from the taxes, will exact larger tithes, and by so doing will ruin agriculture. *Abyssus abyssum vocat.* Oppression produces misery, and extreme misery leads to depopulation. This is the way in which Spain lost half of her population. How many tears and how much ruin are represented by the interest on Turkish loans that has been recently

paid to the creditors! No civilized country can lend its aid, direct or indirect, in maintaining such a system.

From this vicious circle the only way of escape is foreign intervention, and to Austria alone, as is justly repeated again and again, can this mission be entrusted. If there is any government which ought to be the heir of the sick man it is Austria. Austria is the only great power whose confines touch those of Turkey. Already she has on her territory a part of the populations that occupy the neighbouring regions, Roumanians, Serbs, Croats, Bosniacs,—in such a way that ethnological sympathies, whose influence is incessantly growing stronger, are one day sure to force on one side or another the reunion of members that the chance of events disjoined. The reconstitution of nationalities has causes so deep that nothing can hinder its accomplishment. The nationality of the Southern Slavs will one day reconstitute itself either under the auspices of Austria, or else on its ruins. Prince Bismarck has said on this subject a simple and profound thing that describes the entire situation: The centre of gravity of Austria will be displaced eastwards. The mission of Austria is in her name, Ost Reich, the eastern empire. Since Count Andrassy has traced the plan of the reforms to be sought from the Porte, it is to him that the task of supervision naturally falls. To urge and sustain him in this path is what England and Germany ought to do; their interests here are identical. For good policy, statesmen ought to act in the direction of events that must be brought to pass by the plain force of circumstances. Bismarck and Cavour did great things, because they made themselves the instruments of that mighty idea which carries all before it in our time—the constitution of nationalities. No doubt, neither Count Andrassy nor the Hungarians desire intervention in Turkey. But let them think of the future. If they thrust from them all responsibility for Ottoman affairs, Russia will sooner or later be drawn on to act, and if she succeeds, Austria is lost. Supported by Germany and England, she has nothing to fear.

Can we also count upon France? There is some ground for doubt. Our newspapers have recently made advances towards the adoption of a common policy by invoking the memories of the Crimean war. These advances have been rather contemptuously repulsed. They have been met in some such words as these:—"We have carried on policy à la française quite long enough; that is to say, policy for other people. Let us now take to policy à l'anglaise, that is to say, policy for ourselves." Nothing could be more desirable. France has no vital interest engaged in eastern affairs. She has very good reasons for not plunging gratuitously into them. But it is a curious illusion, and one that has become universal in France, to suppose that the French took part in the Crimean war to give pleasure to England. Napoleon III. would make war for an idea, but for a Napoleonic idea only, not an English idea. If he sought an alliance with England, it was only because in this way he was procuring admission—he, an adventurer who had climbed to power by crime—into the circle of European sovereigns; because in this way he was restoring her prestige to France, and satisfying an army that had raised him to the throne. The Crimean expedition was not made in an English, but in a dynastic, interest.

Independently of the oriental complications that bind her so closely, Austria finds herself also struggling with domestic difficulties. Annual deficits have accumulated until a loan has become necessary. A still graver thing—the union of Austria and Hungary—the dualism conceived by Deak—seems threatened in connection with the revision of treaties of commerce. Hungary insists that she was sacrificed in that compromise, and was made to bear an unfairly large share of debt.* She is against protective duties, and claims the concession of financial preferences, threatening in case of non-compliance, to restore the customs line that divided the two countries in old days. The Austrians are indignant at these exaggerated demands and threats. Better, they say, personal union, than new concessions.

Personal union used to be the programme of the Hungarian opposition. But the Hungarians ought carefully to avoid anything that can weaken the Dual Empire, for assuredly it is they who have now the upper hand, and in case of any dislocation they would see themselves confronted by a Slav and Rouman majority which they would find it troublesome to hold in. At present, they lean upon the Cisleithan Germans, who are the root of their strength. Left to themselves, they would sooner or later become subordinate to the other nationalities, which are already superior to them in numbers, which are developing, and which are learning to look to neighbouring populations of the same origin. The Hungarians have a great part to play in the east, if they know how to understand it. Egoism will ruin them; devotion to the development of the other nationalities will save and magnify them. Sooner or later, by the influence of railways, by the spread of knowledge, by the growth of wealth, the various Slav and Rouman groups will acquire more power, and will incline to form a union according to their ethnographical affinities. It is for the Hungarians to direct this great movement of transformation. If they insist on opposing it, it will assuredly crush them.

Elections are about to take place in Spain; but it is impossible to feel any great interest in the electoral struggle. The result is foreseen. Every Spanish government that appeals to the electors, invariably obtains an overwhelming majority. Nowhere, not even in imperial France, has the art of making people vote according to the wishes of the ministry in power been pushed further than in Spain. Only this factitious majority is no sooner arrived at Madrid, than it falls to pieces, and overturns the ministry by whose means it was elected. Castelar publishes a long and eloquent electoral manifesto. It is extremely sensible, and shows that Castelar has profited by the lessons of experience. At bottom, the ideal which he used to defend, that of a federal republic, seems to be perfectly adapted to Spain. Notwithstanding the incessant efforts of centralised despotism to establish a unity like that of France, Spain has always remained a federation of provinces. Provincialism, or—to use the German phrase—Particularism, is in this country more full of life, more deeply rooted, more abundant in contrasts and oppositions, than it is either in Germany or in Switzerland. It is provincialism that maintains the struggle in the north under the flag of Don Carlos. Each province has its dialect, its manners, its traditions, its distinct

interests. They all live an independent life; they do not feel themselves touched by one another's agitations. The whole south is free from any trouble about the civil war that rages in the north. Business does not suffer. The traffic on the railways is as active. The whole machinery of trade works as if all were peaceful. If each province could have assured to it an autonomy like that which is enjoyed by the Swiss cantons, then Spain would have a constitution in accord with her history, as well as with her present character, and so might enjoy order and liberty.

What ruins Spain is centralisation, and the relics which she is bent on preserving of the greatness of old time—first, Madrid, secondly, Cuba. It is Madrid, that centre of political intrigue and parasitic corruption, that relieving office for *déclassés* without resources—Madrid, that city born in a desert, against the design of nature, and by the malign action of despotism—it is Madrid that devours the revenues of the provinces, and gives them back in return only confusion and revolution. What is needed is to deprive the capital of its preponderance, by restoring to the provinces the greater portion of those duties and public rights of which the central power has laid hold. Evidently such a transformation can only be brought about gradually and in time of peace. During the agitated days that Castelar passed in power, it was impossible for him to busy himself in administrative reforms; but it is these reforms, with decentralisation for their aim, that the party of the federal republic ought to pursue. They have seen clearly that under a centralised system, the republic cannot exist; it succumbed less by the force of its enemies than by its own weakness and lack of vital force.

In the middle ages Spain was covered by small independent states, which were genuine republics, as the Navarrese provinces are to this day. Under this system, Spain was free, prosperous, happy, and it is exactly such a system that her statesmen ought to strain every nerve to restore. If Italy has shown an immediate fitness for constitutional government and modern liberties, it is because, thanks to her division into different states, local life had preserved great strength at Florence, Milan, Turin, Bologna, Naples, Palermo, Messina. It is well to establish political unity in order to bind up the various provinces that form a nationality; but it is a fatal error to strip them of their peculiar life and native originality.

Montalembert has shown in a recently-published paper that Spain was long prosperous and free. The Spaniards, he says, were brave and industrious, so long as they were unshackled by masters. But Spain has been destroyed by the association of two despotisms—the despotism of the Church, and the despotism of kings. Intolerance, the Inquisition, and tyrannical centralisation, drove out Moors, Jews, and Protestants; killed industry, stifled thought, depopulated the land. Never has a clearer, a more terrible lesson been given to man. Never has it been more unmistakably seen how a nation is undone when it once allows itself to be robbed of its freedom. Never has decay been more profound, more swift. Only the Ottoman Empire offers a similar sight. No doubt it is not dogma that Montalembert accuses; the doctrine that he charges with ruining Spain and threatening the future of France is Vaticanism. Though intolerance and the Inquisition have destroyed Spain, the Spanish bishops in the

pending elections deliberately place only one object before their partisans : to restore these very things. This is what their electoral circular (January 10) says :—" Freedom of worship is condemned by propositions 77, 78, and 79 of the Syllabus of the immortal pontiff, Pius IX. : no Catholic, therefore, can vote for this mischievous freedom, nor send to the Cortes men who have resolved to establish it in Spain. It is our duty to direct all our legal action to keeping out of the Assembly and the Senate those who cherish any such design." As the Syllabus is in truth universal, it follows that all over the world the Church persecutes freedom of worship. And Lord Acton will still say that Rome does not interfere in temporal things.

Another embarrassment which Spain has inherited from her vanished greatness are the colonies of the Antilles. They are a heavy burden for her, a root of ruin, a perpetual source of danger. If the Spanish Government had been free to devote to the repression of war at home, the men and money that are sent away every year to Cuba, there is every probability that peace would have been restored long ago. The prolongation of the evils of intestine war is the consequence of the possession of Cuba. Besides this, another consequence is the frequent occasion of conflict with other states, as recent incidents prove. The Spanish fleet is at the Antilles ; therefore it cannot exercise a proper vigilance on the coasts of the provinces that are occupied by the insurgents. The insurgents fire on foreign ships passing within reach of their guns. English vessels having been struck, commerce demands resort to energetic measures, and would have England make the Spanish government answerable for these violations of international law. Spain of course can do nothing in the matter, but she is menaced both in her dignity and her interests.

It is in her relations with the United States, that Cuba especially becomes a serious stumbling-block to her. Undoubtedly aid is given to the Cuban insurgents from the neighbouring shores of the Union. The Spanish cruisers try to put a stop to this ; hence constant impediments to the regular commerce, and a good many measures that are by no means right according to the law of nations. Hence, again, energetic complaints from the American government, and from time to time threatening warnings, such as President Grant has launched more than once. The European public has just been admitted to the discussion now pending between the American and Spanish governments, and the energetic Note of the American Secretary (Nov. 5) must prove the prelude to measures more energetic still. That an American minister should not only be anxious to state the grievances of his countrymen in Cuba in such a way as to secure European sympathy, but should also directly appeal to European governments is a curious departure from the rather ostentatious isolation which American diplomacy has been wont to observe hitherto.

The United States have no interest in annexing Cuba. It would be a misfortune for the Union to take into its bosom the power of the Latin and Catholic elements, against which at this very moment the struggle is beginning in the north. But annexation would undoubtedly be in the interest of the Cubans. As a state of the Union, they would be infinitely more free ; they would govern themselves ; they would be delivered from

the shame of slavery; American capital and the American genius for enterprise would lead to a considerable development of the resources of the island; education would spread; civilisation would make rapid progress; and the wealth of the inhabitants would be immensely developed.

Moreover, it is impossible for Spain to preserve much longer her colonies in the Antilles. She will sooner or later recognise their independence; there is in this a sort of historic law. All great colonies emancipate themselves. Brazil broke away from Portugal; Peru, Chili, the States of the Plate and Central America, have all won their independence. Cuba will follow their example. If the rebellion were stifled to-day, it would break out again after a few years of rest and material prosperity. Cuba belongs too manifestly to the circle of attraction of the neighbouring continent, to remain attached to the mother-country, struggling against factions over sea. Since emancipation is unavoidable, and would be for Spain an immense relief, it is for men like Castelar, who are capable of a policy of lofty aims, and who consider the future, to dare to tell their countrymen the truth, at the risk of fretting Castilian vanity. Such an act of wisdom would be honourable to the Spanish people. It would be a thousand times more glorious for them, than any number of those wretched victories, so frequently stained as they are by cruelties, which they now and then gain over the Cuban insurgents.

M. Pelletan published a piquant writing some years ago, entitled *Qui perd gagne*, in which he showed, history in hand, that after a war it is often the vanquished that prove to be happiest. He cited among other examples, Austria, which was more free and more prosperous after she had no longer dragging at her heel the cannon-ball of Lombardo-Venetia and Italy. He might now add France, delivered by the defeats of 1870 from a corrupting system of government; richer than ever, notwithstanding the costs of the war and the indemnity; and finding in her defeats the prudence and wisdom that will enable her to govern herself, instead of rushing into the arms of a saviour. One enormous gain is that the democratic party has ceased to be a revolutionary party, and has become a governmental party. Except a not very numerous group of irreconcilables, who have neither popularity nor consistency, all the men of movement apply themselves to the defence of the established system. They are therefore the true conservatives. This favourable change, which may procure for France many years of rest and regular progress, is due in part to an institution, in part to a man. The institution is the Republic, and the man is Gambetta. The Republic no longer inspires in any one the juvenile infatuation that men used once to draw from the writers of antiquity and the classic admiration for Athens and Rome. Experience has dissipated these illusions. It has been seen that constitutional monarchy, as it is practised in England, Belgium, Holland, Italy, guarantees to nations as much liberty, and to minorities better protection; than the Republic. But in France, the memories of the French Revolution on one side, and on the other the ill success of the different dynasties that have followed one another during the present century, have attached the most active, stirring, and daring

part of the nation to the republican ideal. The monarchy throws this powerful and dangerous element into opposition. The Republic on the contrary transforms it into a force of social conservatism and defence.

France at the present moment offers a curious spectacle. The country is tranquil; it only asks for security in order to be able to work and profit by an economic situation that is really more powerful than that of any other country in Europe. It is the higher classes only and the political parties that keep up division and agitation. It is true that the general election calls everybody to the struggle. In this connection it is not inopportune to examine what influence and prestige the different parties possess. In fact, plainly only two remain in a position to dispute preponderance and the future,—the Bonapartists and the Republicans.

The Orleanist princes withdraw from political life, discouraged and isolated. The Orleanist party consequently dissolves; some incline to the Republic, following M. Lavergne; others incline to Legitimism. It is curious that this party, which counted in its ranks the greatest number of politicians of eminence, should still have always had so little influence in the country. In the rural districts it was unknown, and in the great towns it was antipathetic to the masses. It had only on its side the intollient and sensible people, and they are in a minority all over the world. • The Comte de Paris would most likely have made an excellent constitutional sovereign, like the two Leopolds in Belgium. Instructed, moderate, not in the least eager for noisy splendour or for power, preoccupied with those economic and industrial questions that are the great matters in our time, he would have presided in an admirable way over the government of the country by itself, by guiding it in the path of humanitarian reforms. But he could only come to power in succession to the Comte de Chambord, and with the support of all the clerical and monarchical forces that are now, as things stand, so profoundly divided.

Legitimism in union with clericalism, though it is destined to lose the greater part of the seats which it has held in the old chamber, will remain a powerful party, because in a Catholic country the clergy have always great forces at their disposal. But in any case we must never forget that in France the clergy does not wield the rural populations entirely at pleasure, as in the other states that are in religious subjection to Rome. Here is one of the peculiar features of the situation. The French peasant has been withdrawn from the influence of the priests, because he bought the property of the clergy and the nobles at the Revolution, and he is always afraid that the old régime would rob him of his acquisitions if it were to return. Tithes, seignorial rights, the restitution of national property—that is what the French rustic dreads, as a peril that has never been definitively got out of the way. In many of the departments the peasants rarely go to mass, more rarely still to confession. The priest therefore has very slight hold upon them. He has not yet an idea of the means of intimidation that are employed elsewhere in confessional and pulpit. He cannot count completely even on the women. Unlike what goes on in other countries, the clergy exercise more power over the rich and comfortable classes than over the common people. Yet their

influence grows, and if they preserve the Catholic universities, they will end by making themselves masters of education in all its degrees—masters, in other words, of the future of France.

Legitimism, left to itself, has not many partisans. The country people repulse it, out of the horror in which they hold the ancient régime; much more the people of the towns, while the bourgeoisie avenges the disdain in which legitimism holds them, by a persistent enmity.

The Radical party at the present moment can only count adherents in certain great towns, Paris, Lyons, Marseilles, Bordeaux. The Socialist sects seem to have disappeared. Gambetta has succeeded in rallying the greater part of the democratic phalanx to the idea of above all things preserving the Republic. But this is a transitory situation. Radicalism and socialism have not ceased to exist. Only they have allowed themselves to be drilled and disciplined, and that is much. Bonapartism is the only force that can possibly hold the moderate republicans in check. The existence of such a party is a phenomenon almost beyond explanation. How in an intelligent country like France can there be found partisans of a system that has cost it three invasions, and which at each fall has cost it the loss of part of its territory? After so ignominious a disaster as Sedan, to think of restoring the Empire, especially to the profit of an unknown youth and a woman whose religious antipathies precipitated France into the gulf, is something not short of madness. And yet here lies the real peril.

Here is where the force of Bonapartism lies. The people have need of poetry, of a legend, of memories. To the Catholic idea, which had become weak, and to the enthusiasm of '89, which had vanished, succeeded the dazzling glory of the first Empire. The worship of the Emperor became for the French peasants a real religion, of which all the old soldiers were the missionaries. The second Empire was coincident with a great development of wealth and a great rise in prices, especially in the products of agriculture. During the reign of Napoleon III. the railways were finished, and they transported the gold of the purchaser into the remotest regions. The small cultivator, owning his plot, kept for himself all the profit, and his revenue was at least doubled. For commodities of every kind, even for wine, though its production was largely increased, the price doubled. Napoleon III. evidently had nothing at all to do with this. Nevertheless, it all went on under the Empire; it was to the Empire therefore that the peasant owed the blessed manna. This is at the root of the profound and indestructible sympathy of the rurals for Bonapartism. As the Republic represents the established order, and as for two years the harvests have been abundant and the price of cattle higher than ever, many peasants will vote for the Republic. But at bottom attachment to the Empire will subsist.

Among the enlightened classes, excepting the place-hunters and the scum of the previous régime, very few people are Bonapartists, but many are "*Bonapartisable*." The present writer asked a deputy of the defunct assembly how many of his colleagues were Bonapartist. "Fifteen or twenty," said he, "but three hundred at least are Bonapartisable." The word paints the situation. The danger for the future is that the clericals and the monarchists are nearly all of them in this category. The clergy

prefer Henry V., but the safety of the church before all things. If Henry V. is not possible, the clergy will attach themselves once more to the Empire, on condition of obtaining favour and power at its hands. In the same way the monarchists of course would far rather see the throne occupied by the representative of legitimacy, but out of hatred for the Republic they would undoubtedly help to elevate Napoleon IV., however vile the shame of such a solution. M. Buffet and the whole party of "moral order" are in this mind. When M. Buffet had the daring to say not long ago from the tribune that the Marshal would never consent to make himself the instrument of radicalism, that meant that the Marshal would never accept a Gambetta ministry. It was a Bonapartist coup d'état with which he threatened France.

According to all the probabilities, the elections will give a chamber in which moderate republicans, and monarchists inclined to rally to the republic, will predominate. The country is above all things eager for rest, and will vote for the maintenance of the existing order. But we must not think for this, that the peril of Bonapartism has disappeared. If the violence of the advanced Left were to stir any disquiet in men's minds, people would begin to suspect the future of the Republic, and instantly an irresistible current would drag the country towards the empire. When such a current once declares itself, it waxes greater as it goes. It is for the republicans to avert the danger. They will only save the Republic, even if it were once well founded, by force of prudence and wisdom. As M. Thiers said, "The Republic will be moderate or it will not be." M. Lavergne, a man whose discernment is as well known in England as it is in France, describes the situation in the following terms: "The most marked symptom, that which does most to reassure me, is a marked mitigation of feeling (*apaisement*) throughout the country. With a few exceptions, that make much stir but have little influence, one might almost say that there is hardly any political passion left. The party *cadres* and party aims subsist, but violence has disappeared. Though this is due in great part to M. Gambetta and the Left, still the deeper cause goes back to our misfortunes. It is, as we see, a new justification of the saying, *Who loses wins*. The political situation and the economic situation of France are as good as they can be. As M. Gambetta has just shown in an eloquent speech, it has only to preserve its actual institutions. Thus the republicans, even the most radical of them, are transformed into conservatives, and they thus become buttresses of order, instead of being, as they once were, agents of disorder. It would not be true to say that France finds herself very well prepared to live as a republic. That is not the case. But that is now the only form of government that can save her from the shame of an imperial restoration, and from the foreign and intestine war that would be its inevitable consequences."

Turning from the problems of other nations to our own, we are unable to forget that the first political incident of the year was the meeting of the Home Rulers at Dublin, followed by the usual negligent criticism in our

own press. One wonders how long we shall have to wait for some Irish Deak? Mr. Bright—who might perhaps even yet live to solve this dismal perplexity—has completed (January 22) the last of a trilogy of speeches which at annual intervals he has addressed to his constituents since the serious illness by which he was for a time withdrawn from political life. In these studied orations he has dealt successively with Education, Free Church, and Free Land—the three points of the Liberal programme. He has recorded his opinion of the advantages to be expected from the changes proposed, and his confidence in their ultimate adoption by the country. It may be expected that advice and suggestions coming from a statesman of Mr. Bright's experience and eminence will now receive the serious consideration and attention that have been hitherto too commonly denied to them. On the Land Question Mr. Bright's utterance is clear and simple. He repudiates all so-called fanciful solutions of the problem before him, and asks only for entire freedom of bequest, and that each generation shall be absolute owner of the soil which it occupies. To this main proposition Mr. Bright joined arguments for the extension of local self-government to the counties, as well for educational as for municipal purposes, and for the assimilation of the borough and county franchises; and he urged the Liberal party to accept this series of reforms as a sufficient incentive to united action and renewed exertions. This is advice to which the advanced Liberals cannot possibly take exception, although they may have reason to fear that in one sense it comes too late for immediate practical use. But it certainly is not open to the objections which wait on the mere official Liberal's urgency that we should suppress all definite aims, and reduce liberalism to a mere waiting for something to turn up. Nor can it be said, as of other recent proposals that a barren change of machinery is alone recommended. It is the results and objects of such a change that are brought to the front, and not the merits of the change by itself. These objects will command the support, and even the enthusiasm, of all genuine Liberals. Had the advice now tendered been offered two years ago by the Ministry to which Mr. Bright belonged, it is not impossible that the Conservative reaction might have been satiated by the return of a few brewers and distillers to the House of Commons, and might still have spared a compact Liberal majority to carry out a policy to the broad principles of which every Liberal is pledged. But for a considerable space the party has remained without a leader or a guide; it has had to grope for its own policy, and to achieve it through much tribulation. Too many sections are now pledged to Disestablishment as the next great movement, to make it quite easy to change face and to press the assault in a new direction. For one hundred persons who have already taken sides on the Church question, and formed an opinion on the kind of solution or the amount of resistance, not ten can be found who have any but the most general conceptions of the numerous and complex issues raised by the proposal for Reform of Land Tenure. And of these ten the larger number are probably already pledged to one or other of those very solutions which Mr. Bright himself repudiates. A long course of preparation and education at the hands of statesmen intimately acquainted

with the innumerable details of the subject will be necessary, before the nation can be expected to have more than a mild enthusiasm for the Land question. Meanwhile the relations of Church and State are capable of being submitted in a single question, "Shall the Church be disestablished and disendowed?" In answering this no elector will be confused by the intricacies of the problem, although it is perfectly true that the simplicity of the main issue covers many difficulties of detail that will arise at a later period. For these reasons, in addition to more personal ones, it seems unlikely that the Nonconformists and advanced Liberals, who are everywhere inclining to make ecclesiastical questions the centre of their policy and exertion, will now postpone their cause in order to combine with Whigs and Liberal Churchmen on some new object, even assuming, what is hardly probable, that the Whigs and Liberal Churchmen would march to the attack of the accepted rights of landowners with lighter hearts than they would bear to the assault on the Establishment. It is perhaps a little hard to imagine that Lord Hartington is eager to take in hand the abolition of entails, of primogeniture, and of long hereditary settlements. However, Mr. Bright has now at any rate completed a programme, and given Liberalism substance and motive. The removal of mischievous restrictions from the soil, the abolition of sectarian privilege, the diffusion of light,—these are aims worth struggling for, because they lead us forward to higher degrees of political justice and fuller national unity. Free Land, Free Church, Free Schools—the order of the procession is of little moment, provided only the procession moves.

For want of more serious topics the newspapers have given some prominence to the speeches of Sir William Harcourt, who has been warning people with political ideas and reasoned principles that they are the nuisances of public life (December 30). Well, *Dès qu'on veut accaparer les hommes, un peu de charlatanisme ne nuit pas*. But it ought not to be pushed too far. To make two lengthy political speeches without a single political idea in them, or a single point of political instruction, or a single political aspiration, save that the national government may make blunders, is surely almost an abuse of the French maxim. It only shows that the qualities which suffice to make a man a considerable figure in the present House of Commons, are not necessarily those which commend him to the respect of the country out of doors. England has been led by men of many types from Cromwell down to Lord Liverpool; neither levity nor even incapacity has prevented them from winning popularity. But England has never yet given her confidence to a politician of open and ostentatious moral vulgarity. Many hard things have been said of Mr. Disraeli within the last thirty years, but no one ever denied that he had the art of surrounding the policy of adventurism with a curious semblance of distinction. Younger men who are dazzled by that strange character and singular career should remember this. The moral flavour of Sir William Harcourt's speeches is to the flavour of Mr. Disraeli's what petroleum champagne is to Tokay. The contrast is as shocking as if one should place the delicate, the quaint, the whimsical mosaic of the Roman jeweller by the side of the staring brilliants of the Lowther Arcade. Sir William Harcourt's hectoring expos-

tulation with a few plain men who try to interest provincial people in serious politics, as distinguished from the game of battledore and shuttlecock among placemen and partisans in London, is a diverting instance of the absurd presumption which seizes even shrewd men who are once thoroughly imbued by the House of Commons tone. What is all this talk about the liberal army and loyalty and party discipline? We have taken no shilling and sworn no oath. Where there is discordancy of sentiment, what avails the circumstance of bearing the same party nickname? It is the sentiment, and not the nickname, that defines political obligation. A man's party consists of those who agree with him. The important thing for us is not to restore the last government, but to prevent party distinctions in England from becoming as meaningless as the distinctions between Democrat and Republican have been more than once in the United States, to the egregious deterioration of all public life in that country whenever it has happened. The battle is for causes, not for persons; for elevation of the national life, not for promoting the claims of individuals to office. However, the Lqwthor Arcade is a cheerful and prosperous spot in its way, and no most advanced liberal cherishes any resentment against Sir W. Harcourt. He has been an advanced liberal himself before now, and we are all quite sure that he will be so again, as soon as political opinion in the country has been effectively stirred by those whom he now rather gracelessly denounces as the nuisances of public life.

The speeches by which Mr. Holms has endeavoured to excite public interest about the army are of a much more respectable stamp than these "lean and flashy songs" about the Liberal party. Mr. Holms has taken up a substantial and important question; he has adopted certain views upon it; and he follows the proper and wholesome course of trying to bring the constituencies to agree with him. The condition of the army is of high importance, whether we happen to be adherents of non-intervention, or dissidents from it. For if we are bent on never intervening, the military instrument is much too costly; and if we are in any risk of intervening, it is much too weak. It is true that there are a good many points in the organization of the army, about which it is hard for anybody but experts to form a solid opinion. And the experts have been allowed to have their own way, with a result that must be at least as unsatisfactory to themselves as it is to other people. The nation has an odd and not very intelligible feeling about soldiers. It has no such pride in them as it has in its sailors. There is a very unjust tendency to look upon the Line as the resort of the noodles of the upper classes and the scapegraces of the lower. The arrival of militia regiments for their periods of training is abhorred by the towns where they are quartered. All the associations of national pride seem to have centred round one of the two great services, and there is no keen and vigorous interest in the other. This is the only explanation of the fact that the government of the army is allowed to remain a sort of special craft and mystery, about which the constituencies are absolutely ignorant and indifferent. Criticism has damaged some of Mr. Holms's figures, but the War Office ought to be as grateful as any one else to any member of parliament who endeavours to make the subject one of genuine popular interest. Whatever may be the

case with the Duke of Cambridge and the small professional clique, a statesman like Mr. Hardy can have no wish to veil the actual facts about the army, what our forces are, what they ought to be, and how they are to be made what they ought to be. It may be very well to march valorously into the great European camp with one hundred and seventy-six thousand sharers in a French canal company, by way of buckler and sword. But if our army, which must always be a comparatively small one, is not only ostensibly small, but even smaller and more of a skeleton than it looks, we shall one day pay for our temerity and virtuous disinterestedness by faring extremely ill in the great European camp. The prevailing inclination to take more of a part in continental concerns, going along with the prevailing disinclination to accept the obligation of personal military service in any shape, marks a really perilous state of things. It is folly to talk of alliances, interventions, backing of representations, unless you are prepared to pay the price; yet the louder this talk becomes, the harder is it to find recruits for Militia and Line. Your foreign policy, we were told not many years ago on high authority, must govern your armaments. It would be a wholesome rule that nobody should be allowed to ask us to lift a finger in Europe, unless he is prepared to remedy the present dead failure of voluntary enlistment. To take another point of view. If it be true that our armed force is absolutely inadequate to resist 100,000 invaders of the best continental stamp, then our independence is in the last resort at the mercy of any great brigand who may again arise in Europe. Again, if things are not so bad as this, it is still true that our military instrument is enormously costly, and tends to become more so in proportion as the wages of pacific industry rise; that we shall get a constantly deteriorating class of recruits; and that we maintain a host of the community, prevented from marriage, devoid for the most part of industrial skill, and cut off from civil life. The maintenance of a force which is at once inefficient for its purpose, prodigiously expensive, and a demoralised element of social life, can scarcely be a permanent article of national policy. And such a force cannot be maintained. The figures are deplorable, and so are the men. But compulsion, we are told, is not to be dreamt of. The nation will never endure it. And just in the same way only three or four years ago we used to be told that the nation would never endure compulsion in the education of their children. Yet we see that the nation does endure it, and endures it cheerfully, and seeks its extension. The truth is that Englishmen are less foolish than timorous politicians think. They will bear whatever they have been persuaded is necessary and wholesome for the national good. Why will people not speak with some manliness in this matter? A conscription of German, or even of French, severity could no doubt only be borne in an extreme crisis of English destiny. This is not now possible, and it is not necessary. But there is a growing necessity—and perhaps not less a moral than a military necessity—to accept the principle of personal liability and obligation to serve in the militia, and in a militia of a much more effective and strenuous sort than our present system produces. Care would have to be taken that no shadow of privilege or exemption, within the limits of age, should attach to high rank or a long purse. That done, if the young mechanic had to bear the same burden as the young lawyer or young peer,

and if the case were fairly and frankly laid before the people, what reason is there to suppose that Englishmen would be less willing to do their duty in this than in other respects? There is nothing in the principle of a National as distinguished from a hired Standing army, with which a Liberal need quarrel, while there is much in the way of morality and discipline and patriotism which he may very eagerly embrace. One of the soundest Liberals that ever lived, wrote in 1871: "Militarism in some form we must have; and it seems to me, our wisdom will lie, not in holding up our hands and screaming against the inevitable, but in endeavouring to minimise, as far as may be, the necessary evil, and in extracting from it, while it lasts, whatever accidental element of good it may contain. This is what the scheme of national armies does accomplish. . . . The popular principle by diffusing attenuates the evil, and making every man potentially a soldier, places the liberties of the country on the only sure foundation, the ability of all in the last resort to defend them." (J. E. Cairnes: *Political Essays*, 247.)

Compulsory training for home service will not help us over the difficulty of manning the regular army, with the drafts for India. The necessity of a garrison in India is probably one of the worst of the many drawbacks of the most tremendous task which *μολρα κραταιή* ever imposed on a people. Indian service is at once one of the main causes of the weakness of our home battalions, and of the reluctance of our people to enlist. However, India has to be faced, just as an armed and restless Europe has to be faced. Only it is time to come out of the fool's paradise in which as to military affairs we have been longer content to remain, than is consistent with national self-respect.

The chief object of popular interest has been the Fugitive Slave Circular. Whether the instructions recently issued by the Admiralty to the captains of the Navy are in accordance with the best traditions of English policy may be brought to a simple test. In admitting fugitive slaves on board English ships on the high seas, the Admiralty is hampered by no international obligations. On the high seas, an English ship knows no law but the law of England. On the high seas we are free to indulge our hatred of slavery, "the sum of all villainies," and even if our prejudice in favour of freedom were less respectable than it is, we have a right to enjoy the luxury without exposing ourselves to any legitimate ground of complaint. The effect of admitting a slave on board an English ship of war on the high seas is the same as allowing him to touch the soil of England,—he immediately becomes free. This was settled in the case of *Forbes v. Cochrane* in 1824. An English captain, therefore, in admitting a fugitive slave on board his ship confers on him the boon of liberty. By what principle should a captain be guided, in exercising this privilege? Should he, in favour of freedom, admit fugitive slaves so far as consistent with the discipline and convenience of his vessel? Or should he out of tenderness to the interests of his master refuse an asylum to the slave? The answer given by the Second Circular is as follows:—"When any person professing or appearing to be a fugitive slave, seeks admission to your ship on the high sea, beyond the limit of territorial waters, and claims the protection

of the British flag, you will bear in mind that *her Majesty's ships are not intended for the reception of persons other than their officers and crew.* You will satisfy yourself, therefore, before receiving him on board, that *there is some sufficient ground in the particular case for thus receiving him.*" It is worthy of remark that this instruction lays down no clear or intelligible rule; it does not say when a fugitive slave should be admitted and when he should not; but it throws on the captain the burden of showing cause why he should in the particular case admit the slave. What is the meaning of this churlish and inhospitable order? That may be learned from Circular No. 1. That circular affirmed as "a broad rule," that "a fugitive slave should not be permanently received on board any description of ship under the British flag, unless his life would be endangered if he were not allowed to come on board." The reason for this rule is then stated. "A contrary rule would lead to endless disputes and difficulties with the legal masters of slaves; for it might happen, to take an extreme instance, that the whole slave portion of the crews of vessels engaged in the pearl fishery in the Persian Gulf might take refuge on board British ships, and, if free there, their masters would be entirely ruined, and the mistrust and hatred caused in their minds would be greatly prejudicial to British interests."

The chain of reasoning that has led the Government to abandon the traditions of English policy is thus apparent. If a slave gets on board an English vessel he will be free: if he is free, his master will be deprived of his services; if his master is deprived of his services, he will be angry with us; if the master is angry with us, it will be prejudicial to our interests. The conclusion is inevitable. The door is to be shut in the face of the slave *because* it is the gateway of freedom. To this pusillanimous conclusion, through the steps of an ignoble sorites, are we led by "the spirited foreign policy" of the Government.

It is to be hoped that the Government will not be allowed to ride off from the plain issue raised in the first part of the circular, under cover of the questions of international law contained in the second part. In the reception of fugitive slaves on the high sea, unfettered by any international obligations, the Admiralty instructs its subordinates that they are to use the privilege of hospitality not for, but against the slave; not against, but for the master. A fugitive slave on board a ship on the high seas is to be a *rara avis*; but when the ship is in a port of a slaveholding State, or anywhere within three miles of its shores, the exclusion of slaves is to be peremptory and absolute. "If while your ship is within the territorial waters of a State where slavery exists, a person professing to be a fugitive slave seeks admission into your ship, *you will not admit him unless his life would be in manifest danger if he were not received on board.* Should you, in order to save him from this danger, receive him, *you ought not, after the danger is past, to permit him to continue on board.*"

It will be difficult to reconcile the country to this harsh and unbending rule, unless it be conclusively shown that the requirements of international law leave the Government no alternative. If a captain, without violating the law of nations, can give shelter to a slave, and he voluntarily sends the man back to slavery, he is made an accomplice in the crime of robbing him of his

liberty, which English judges tell us is originally the gift of nature. If, moreover, it appears that in order to find an excuse for refusing shelter to slaves, the circular introduces a new rule of international law, and tampers with our rights, the Government will deserve and obtain the severest condemnation.

All authorities agree that a ship of war within the territorial waters of a foreign State continues to "remain a part of the territory of her sovereign." Mr. Justice Phillimore states the rule thus:—"Long usage and universal custom entitle every such ship [of war] to be considered as a part of the State to which she belongs, and to be exempt from any other jurisdiction." Nevertheless, the Second Circular, undeterred by the evil fate of the First, proceeds, with magnificent nonchalance, to cut down the right of extra-territoriality. The Government, on their own responsibility, introduce a restriction that appears to be unknown to the best writers and the recognised authorities on international law. The exception is thus expressed:—"You are bound by the comity of nations not to allow her [your vessel] to become a shelter for those who would be chargeable with a violation of the law of the place."

Of all countries in the world England has the strongest interest in maintaining the extra-territoriality of her ships of war. If it be necessary to limit the right, considering the importance of the interests at stake, we ought to proceed with the greatest caution, and avoid committing ourselves to vague rules that may in future give rise to the most embarrassing controversies. Now every word of the new limitation seems to have been introduced for the express purpose of giving occasion to dispute. The phrase "comity of nations" may mean either "that kindness which emanates from a friendly feeling," or something "*due* between nations on the ground of right." In which sense the phrase is to be understood the circular does not inform us. But in whichever sense it be understood, it will place the Government in an awkward position. If the admission of persons chargeable with violating the law of the place would give "a just cause of complaint," we are landed in this difficulty. Would not the State having such a just cause of complaint be entitled to prevent by force a vessel that had incriminated persons on board from leaving her territorial waters? The right to depart unmolested is conditional upon the friendly conduct of the ship of war. If then she violates a law imposed by the comity of nations, is not the right forfeited? Are we then prepared to submit to the arrest and detention of a vessel of war on the ground that she has persons on board "who would be chargeable with a violation of the law of the place"? These are some of the consequences we must face if we admit that the exclusion of obnoxious persons is *due* as a matter of right. If then we take the other alternative, and affirm that their exclusion is to be done from "that kindness which emanates from friendly feeling," the Government is impaled on the other horn of a dilemma. Surely if the exclusion of slaves from our ships is not due by strict law, but only by courtesy, the people of England may claim that our kindness shall be shown to the victim, not to his oppressor,—to the slave that is robbed of his rights, not to the man that robs him.

THE FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

NO. CXI. NEW SERIES.—MARCH 1, 1876.

THE DISESTABLISHMENT MOVEMENT.

WE have been reminded lately, with considerable emphasis, that the question of the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the English Church is “eminently a practical one,” and that “it cannot be dealt with according to abstract theories.” Thirty years ago, when the Disestablishment movement began, there was apparent ground for the suggestion that its leaders did not discriminate between the province of political speculation and the province of practical politics.

The movement had its origin in deep religious convictions—I might almost say, in fervent religious enthusiasm. Mr. Edward Miall and the men who were associated with him in founding what is now known as the Liberation Society, objected to the ecclesiastical Establishment because they believed that it was altogether out of harmony with the genius of the Christian faith. To them it seemed that the Establishment had succeeded in secularising the Church, and that it had failed in Christianising the State. They argued that the zeal of the laity is repressed when the maintenance of the institutions of worship is provided for by national endowments; that the system of patronage, which they contended is an essential part of the Establishment, must exert a pernicious influence on the spirit and on the efficiency of the clergy; and that when the creed and ritual of a Church are fixed by act of parliament, the Church suffers a loss of spiritual freedom, for which the alleged advantages it receives from the State can constitute no adequate compensation. All these arguments were illustrated and enforced by an appeal to notorious and glaring ecclesiastical abuses, nearly all of which have disappeared, and which to the present generation are almost incredible.

The movement was religious in its origin, and for many years nearly all who took a prominent part in it were actuated by religious motives. But as no practical results were possible apart from politi-

cal action, it was necessary to justify the movement on political grounds. The leaders found an extremely convenient political theory ready to their hand. They were Radicals, and many of the Radicals of those days believed that when the State attempts anything more than the direct defence of life and property against "force and fraud," it passes beyond the limits within which its action should be confined. On that theory the State exceeds its true powers when it builds lighthouses on the dangerous points of our coast; when it makes an ordnance survey, and publishes ordnance maps; when it sends an expedition to the North Pole; when it establishes a post-office, and buys up the telegraph lines; votes money to the London University and to the British Museum; and above all, when it levies rates and makes grants from the Consolidated Fund for the erection and maintenance of elementary schools. The theory reduces the State to a machine for building prisons and courts of law; for organizing the police, selecting jurymen, and paying the salaries of judges.

This ignoble and impracticable limitation of the functions of the State has been long abandoned. As a party—there are individual exceptions—the Radicals have been gradually drifting to a theory which is the precise antithesis of the creed held by many Radicals thirty years ago. The change in their position has excited the surprise and even the anxiety of liberal politicians on the Continent who are acquainted with English politics. During the first quarter of this century, it was the Tory party which was always calling for the interference of the State in the affairs of the people, and the theory of a paternal government was the perpetual object of Radical invective and derision. Now it is the advanced wing of the Radical party which insists that in a thousand directions the State has been guilty of a flagrant neglect of duty, and that the wealth and intelligence, and the general prosperity of the country imperatively demand new legislation. This extraordinary revulsion of opinion admits of a very simple and obvious explanation; but at first sight the history of the Radical party during the last half century in relation to the true limits of legislative action is as grotesque as the story of the apparent inconsistencies of William von Humboldt. In 1792 he wrote an essay—fortunately he did not publish it—in which he contended that both education and the maintenance of religion lie altogether beyond the true province of civil government; in 1809 he was a Prussian minister of state, and had charge of the department of religious worship and public instruction.

It was a mere accident, however, that the early Liberationists identified their movement with the narrowest, meanest, and most impracticable political theory that any rational intellect ever invented. When the theory disappeared, one of the stock arguments

was no longer heard from Liberation platforms, but the forces which gave real strength to the movement continued to act with undiminished vigour. No element of power had been lost.

There are no doubt many Liberationists who still hold a "theory" about the functions of civil government in relation to religion. But the theory is negative rather than positive. They contend that the State is necessarily disqualified by the nature of its organization for interfering advantageously with religious faith and worship, and that the characteristic life and glory of modern civilisation consist in the gradual rescue of the whole domain of religion from the control of the civil government. The general principle assumes a more definite form when it is stated by those Liberationists who have a strong faith in the supernatural claims of the Christian revelation. To "establish" a false religion must be pernicious; and for a Christian government to endeavour to suppress a false religion by public law is to violate the fundamental principles of the Christian faith. To persecute Christianity is a crime; to endeavour to sustain it by any other means than the spontaneous service and free gifts of those who believe in it, is contrary to its essential spirit; and to place the control of the Church and the administration of its affairs in the hands of secular rulers is certain to lessen its spiritual power and to render ecclesiastical and doctrinal corruption inevitable. The State may resist religious organizations when they imperil social order and tranquillity; it may punish priests when, in the name of religion, they inflict any injury on the person, or property, or reputation of individual citizens; it may restrain acts which are immoral and of evil example, even when those acts are defended by an appeal to religious sanctions; it may repress public religious celebrations which disturb the public peace; in other words, when religion encroaches on the province of the State, the State has the right, and is under the obligation, to assert its own authority, and to protect the general interests of the nation; but religion, as such, should neither be assisted nor persecuted by civil governments.

Those Nonconformists who are most active and prominent in the Liberation movement, hold some such theory as this. But the theory is no essential part of the case of the Liberationists. A man may be a zealous Liberationist, and yet believe that when Augustine came to England it was natural and expedient that the Saxon kings who received the new faith should enforce the payment of tithes, and give to bishops and mitred abbots seats in the national councils. He may glory in the policy of Elizabeth and her statesmen in relation to Rome, and may only regret that the policy was not more consistent, more vigorous, and more thorough. But the question has become one of practical politics, and passed to the "positive stage."

This transition has been greatly assisted by a clearer apprehension during the last few years of the true nature of the ecclesiastical Establishment in this country. Till recently the popular conception of it corresponded very closely with that of Bishop Warburton. The State and the Church were regarded as two great independent powers which had entered into an alliance for their mutual advantage—the State conferring authority, dignity, and wealth, the Church, in return, surrendering a large measure of her independence, and engaging to promote the cause of order and morality among the people. Neither the Liberationists nor their opponents have quite given up this way of stating the case. Conservative newspapers still describe the Church as a great corporation possessing vast wealth, which the State is bound to respect just as it respects the wealth of great landed proprietors. Liberation speakers still denounce the injustice of which the State is guilty in selecting one Church out of many, and conferring on its ministers exceptional privileges, and endowing them with national property. The Liberation attack is no doubt fairly justified by what Mr. Freeman describes as “the actual state of English law as to ecclesiastical matters.”¹ The Conservative idea of a great corporation is a delusion altogether. There is no such corporation as the Church of England known to English law. Nor, on the one hand, was there ever any formal contract between the State and the Church, nor any deliberation on the part of the State as to which of several Churches it should endow. Nor is there, properly speaking, an “alliance” between the Church and the State in England any more than there is an alliance between the army and the State, or between the State and the Civil Service. “An alliance between Church and State in a Christian commonwealth,” said Edmund Burke, “is, in my opinion, an idle and fanciful speculation. An alliance is between two things that are in their nature distinct and independent, such as between two Sovereign States. But in a Christian commonwealth the Church and the State are one and the same thing, being different parts of the same whole.” Richard Hooker held the same ground. He said in his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, “There is not any man of the Church of England but the same is also a member of the commonwealth, nor any member of the commonwealth which is not also of the Church of England.” This is what Dean Stanley means when he describes Methodists, Independents, and Baptists as “nonconforming members of the Church of England.”

Mr. Freeman has put the case very clearly:—“In early times the Church was simply the nation, looked at with reference to religion, just as the army was the nation looked at with reference to warfare. The nation in its civil, its ecclesiastical, and its military character

(1) See the whole passage, “Disestablishment and Disendowment.” By Edward A. Freeman, pp. 26—30.

might have three sets of leaders."¹ "The whole thing, in short, like everything else in this country, came of itself. The Church Establishment has just the same history as the House of Commons or as trial by jury. It is the creation of the law; but it is not the creation of any particular law, but of the general course of our law, written and unwritten."² "The ministers of the Church were national officers for one set of purposes, enjoying the rights and privileges and subject to the responsibilities of national officers."³ "This is beyond doubt the original meaning of the Church being 'by law established.' It does not mean, as the word is used now, an 'Established Church,' as opposed to some other religious body which is not 'established.' This is a sense which grew up later. The Church was 'established,' as any other of the institutions of the country was established. It was 'established' just as government by King, Lords, and Commons was 'established.' It no more came into any man's head that there could be another Church; Popish or Puritan, alongside of the Anglican Church established by law, than that there could be another government, despotic or republican, alongside of the limited monarchy established by law."⁴

The institution was the natural growth of ages, when religious divisions were unknown in England, or when they were vigorously repressed. In those days the parishioners in every parish in the country were baptized at the same font, said the same creed, confessed to the same priest, were married with the same rites, worshipped before the same altar. Apart from any "theory" about the limits of the true province of civil government, it was just as reasonable that the priesthood should be a national institution as the magistracy, just as reasonable that the Archbishop of Canterbury should have a seat in the House of Lords as the Lord Chancellor. There is no occasion for Liberationists to contend that in those times the national organization for religious purposes was either unjust or injurious. They may even admit that it assisted to civilise the nation and to consolidate national unity; that the position which it gave to the clergy was friendly to the diffusion of education and encouraged the more peaceful virtues, that the honours and authority which it conferred upon bishops were a wholesome restraint on the power of rough and ignorant and turbulent barons.

But the whole condition of the nation has undergone a great and vital change. At the present moment half the population appear to have given up attendance at public worship altogether. Of the remaining half, the national Church can claim only a doubtful majority. The number of those who, even on the occasion of marriage, accept the office of the national clergy is steadily de-

(1) "Disestablishment and Disendowment," p. 41.

(2) *Ibid.*, p. 42.

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 44.

(4) *Ibid.*, pp. 47, 48.

clining.¹ And yet the national Church remains. Its bishops are still nominated by the Crown and sit in the House of Lords. Ecclesiastical law is still a special branch of the legal profession, and is administered by special judges. There is still a clergyman of the national Church in every parish in the kingdom. In hundreds of cases he is appointed by the Lord Chancellor or by the Crown. He alone has the right to conduct worship in the parish church, and to utter words of sorrow and hope and consolation over the dead that are buried in the parish graveyard. He still retains that civil right to tithe the produce of the land, which was originally conceded to the priests a thousand years ago, when all who owned the land and all who cultivated it claimed their services. Estates which were given by private benefactors or were reserved under enclosure acts, for the maintenance of the clergy when men were burnt or imprisoned, or exiled for disbelieving their teaching or neglecting their worship, are still appropriated to their support. We have, therefore, the extraordinary anomaly of a national institution for providing religious worship in which one half of the nation refuse to join, and which is so unsatisfactory to half of the remaining half that they prefer to provide forms of worship of their own. The

(1) About 75 per cent. of the population are still married at church. For the Church to claim three-fourths of the nation as churchmen because they go to church to be married is, however, most preposterous. In most parts of the country it is much more convenient to be married at church than to be married at a Nonconformist chapel. The clergyman unites in himself the office of minister of religion and registrar, so that the bridegroom and his friends have to obtain the presence of only one man if the marriage is at church. The services of two men have to be obtained at a Nonconformist marriage. The registration "districts" are also extremely confusing, and sometimes occasion grave inconvenience. People who have no religion at all get married at church as a matter of course, just as nearly all the burglars and wife-beaters committed to gaol register themselves as "churchmen." Since, notwithstanding the special inconvenience attaching to dissenting weddings, and the sentimental attractions to which even Dissenters are not insensible, of a service celebrated in an ancient and beautiful building, a fourth of the population are married either at chapel or at the registrar's office—where, by the way, many Dissenters prefer to have their marriages legally performed—it is probable that the returns of the religious census of 1851 may still be trusted. These showed, speaking broadly, that half the population were absent from worship on census Sunday; and that those who were present were about equally divided between the Establishment and the sects, in other words, that the sects had secured about a fourth of the population. For the Church to claim the adherence of almost three-fourths of the nation, on the ground that about three-fourths of the children educated in public elementary schools are educated in Church of England schools, would be—well, I will simply call it audacious. It is obvious that throughout the rural districts, it is rarely practicable, and still more rarely desirable, to have more than one school within the reach of most of the population. If there can be only one school, and if that school is a denominational school, the school is necessarily the school of the clergyman. Under our present educational system vast numbers of Nonconformists are practically compelled to send their children to Church of England schools: to point to their presence there as a proof that their parents are Churchmen, would be to presume a little too much on the ignorance of the country. And since the Establishment has three-fourths of the children at school, how is it that it has secured the attendance of only a fourth of the population at church?

country is covered with religious teachers commissioned by the State and under its control, to whose teaching one half of the nation refuse to listen, while half of the remaining half meet every week to listen to men who by their very separation from the national Establishment imply that in their judgment much of its teaching is false, or that its discipline or ritual merits strong condemnation. What they all imply by their separation, many of them very distinctly express, maintaining that the doctrine of the national Church is not the doctrine of Christ and of his apostles, that its polity is out of harmony with the principles and spirit of the Christian faith, and that some of its offices are tainted with the old superstitions which for centuries impaired the strength and obscured the glory of the religious life of all Christendom.

Nor can a statesman disregard the bitter and vehement conflicts by which the adherents of the national Church are themselves distracted. It seems probable that not more than a fourth of the population regularly attend the services conducted by the national clergy, and of this number a very considerable proportion are incessantly protesting against the manner in which the services are conducted, and denouncing the teaching of their authorised religious instructors. All the boundless resources of theological abuse are employed in the interecclésiastical conflict. Evangelical denounces Ritualist, Ritualist denounces Evangelical, and they both unite to denounce the Broad Churchman; while the Nonconformists protest against all these, though with better temper and greater moderation than they show to each other. Take any one type of the religious teaching provided by the national Establishment, and it will probably be condemned by a majority of the clergy. The majority of the lay adherents of the Church of England still sympathize, I believe, with evangelical doctrine; but several years ago it was acknowledged that the evangelical party could hardly claim more than a fourth of the whole number of the clergy.

Imagine any other national establishment regarded with indifference, distrust, or hostility by three-fourths of the nation! Imagine any other national establishment about the administration of which the remaining fourth were so seriously divided! A statesman would at once conclude that searching reform or immediate abolition was imperative.

Any movement for the reform of the Establishment, undertaken with a hope of restoring its national character, would be the most quixotic of enterprises. No one having any acquaintance with the principles and spirit of the various sections of Nonconformity would ever dream that such a scheme could be successful. Amiable and scholarly clergymen—familiar with the ecclesiastical struggles of two centuries ago, and not altogether ignorant of the Nonconformist lite-

ture of the first half of the last century, and having perhaps some personal acquaintance with a few elderly Nonconformist laymen or ministers, men of excellent character, and, perhaps of large accomplishments, but whose fighting days are over, and who sigh for rest and peace—sometimes talk hopefully about comprehension. But their proposals come too late. A few Nonconformists might be disposed to consider and to accept a scheme of reconciliation, if the scheme were of a kind which it would be impossible for a statesman to submit to the House of Commons, and which would make Churchmen more furious than any scheme for disestablishment and disendowment; but no scheme, possible or impossible, would have any appreciable effect in diminishing the strength of the great Nonconformist denominations. Make the Church comprehensive enough to admit those who explicitly deny Trinitarianism, and a few Unitarians might come in; but I doubt whether half a dozen Unitarian churches in the country would be closed, or half a dozen Unitarian congregations broken up. Remove from the services of the Church all traces of Sacramentalism, and a few eccentric Independents might conform; but the meetings of the Congregational Union would be just as large and just as active as ever; there would be no arrest of chapel-building; the men who had gone over would not be missed. Offer to receive the Wesleyan Methodists bodily into the Church; permit them to revise the Prayer-Book and its offices; let them preserve all their present organizations and customs,—their class-meetings, their love-feasts, and their circuits; give them sure guarantees that their people would never have to listen to ritualistic preaching, and that their ministers would never have to hear a charge from the learned and kindly, but rather pedantic, Bishop of Lincoln; and then, perhaps, a few score of ministers over forty years of age, and a few dozen wealthy laymen, and a few farmers who find that landlords will not let farms to Wesleyan tenants, might desert the ranks; but the circuits of the ministers and the vacant offices of the laymen would be filled up in a year or two; Wesleyanism would remain as vigorous as before, and its hostility to the political Establishment would be incalculably intensified. Before Tractarianism began to be strong, when Evangelicalism was the supreme power in the Church, a bold, sagacious, and powerful ecclesiastic might, perhaps, have offered terms to Wesleyan Methodists which a considerable proportion of them would have been ready to accept. But the same law of development that has been illustrated in the other Nonconformist communities has been illustrated in the Methodists. They left the Established Church because they were obliged to leave it. Having studied the Establishment under the aspects which it presents to those outside, nothing would induce them to return.

It should be remembered that the Nonconformists have painfully and laboriously built up their separate organizations. They, too, have their traditions. They have their saints and their martyrs. Affection, loyalty, and veneration bind them to the faith and to the polity for which many of them have worked hard, for which some of them have suffered much, and which are associated in the hearts of all with the memories they most care to cherish, both of the living and of the dead.

Comprehension is hopeless. Mr. Brodrick, in the last number of this Review, suggests that perhaps "the wisest Nonconformists" may be "prepared to accept such an ecclesiastical settlement as would bring Church affairs and the disposition of national Church property within the sphere and under the effectual control of local government."¹ I find it difficult to imagine any settlement of this kind that could be proposed to Parliament by a responsible minister. Ecclesiastical struggles, when conducted on a national scale, are sufficiently bitter; parochial and municipal struggles for the control of Church doctrine and discipline would be an intolerable scandal. Is the parish to determine the question whether, on the one hand, the Unitarians are still to be condemned to eternal perdition every Christmas morning, or whether, on the other hand, my friend, Mr. Crosskey, is to be appointed to the rectory with the power of modifying the service as he pleases? Are the rate-payers to have their choice between a priest bringing testimonials from Cardinal Manning and a presbyter strongly recommended by Dr. Cumming? How often might a decision, once reached, be revised? Is there to be a possibility of getting both service and rector changed every November when Town Councillors are elected? Or should the term of office be for three years? Or should it be for life?

Perhaps it might be recommended that the various sects, as far as they can be accommodated, should have the free use of the parish church on Sunday in turn—the Episcopalians in the morning, the Independents in the afternoon, and the Methodists in the evening; and that the tithes and the rent of the glebe should be fairly distributed between them in the ratio of the number of persons attending the several services. But what a terrible outcry there would be in that case from Baptists, Plymouth Brethren, Bible Christians, Primitive Methodists, Unitarians, and all the other religious communities that would be left out in the cold! The larger Nonconformist sects have for the most part no controversies with each other now; the ministers are constantly exchanging pulpits, the congregations of one sect show a friendly and fraternal interest in their neighbours by going to their tea-meetings on week-days, and to their anniversary services on Sundays. But if they ever so lost their heads as to consent

(1) *Fortnightly Review*, February, 1876, p. 193.

to an ecclesiastical settlement, which would make them rivals for a share in the ecclesiastical property in every parish in the kingdom, quiet men who care for peace and Christian charity would have to give up church and chapel-going altogether.

There may no doubt be some districts in which such a scheme could be carried out for a time, without any grave practical difficulty. Where parishes have landlords who are careful to weed out Nonconformist farmers by refusing to accept Nonconformist tenants, and where the vicars are like the Vicar of Woolavington, who thinks it his duty to prevent a Nonconformist schoolmistress from being employed by the School Board lest she should introduce into his ecclesiastical preserve "a probable cause of strife in the shape of schism in petticoats,"¹ some sort of agreement might be arrived at which, perhaps, would work smoothly, until the land happened to come into the hands of a proprietor whose sense of justice was unfortunately more active than his religious bigotry, and the living into the hands of a vicar whose zeal for charity was unhappily stronger than his ecclesiastical antipathies. But there are thousands of parishes in which dissent has made sure its ground, and from which neither landlord nor vicar can expel it. In every one of these, any scheme for remitting ecclesiastical affairs to local control would kindle a conflagration compared with which the old conflict about church rates was mere child's play. What would be the effect of such a scheme in Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Birmingham, and Bradford, let any one imagine, who has learnt from history or knows from experience the possible violence of religious enthusiasm when religious sects forget the true method of diffusing religious faith and strive for political supremacy. Mr. Brodrick's scheme—if I have any understanding of its principles—would receive from Nonconformists, and, I venture to think, from "the wisest Nonconformists," opposition as resolute as it would receive from churchmen.

Comprehension is hopeless. The doors of the Church may be opened as wide as you please—the doors may be taken down altogether—but the Nonconformists will not go in. It is not my present business to justify their refusal. I have simply to state the facts of the case. It must be assumed in this discussion, that whatever the legislature may attempt in the way of re-organizing the Church of England, the religious communities which are outside the Establishment, will remain outside.

Further, the example of Scotland should be sufficient to warn ecclesiastical reformers of the probable effect of any change intended to make the Anglican Establishment more acceptable to Nonconformists.

The obstacles to "comprehension" in Scotland are far less serious than in England. Between the Free Church—the strongest of the

(1) See the Vicar's letter, *Times*, February 5, 1876.

voluntary communities—and the Establishment, the distinctions are hardly appreciable by most southerners. The members of the two Churches accept the same Calvinistic Confession of Faith, and the same Presbyterian polity. Their form of worship is the same. Their mode of administering the Sacraments is the same. Free Churchmen do not deny that the civil magistrate may lawfully render direct aid to the Church of Christ; they have never renounced the theory of a national ecclesiastical Establishment. It was supposed that the Patronage Bill passed two years ago, transferring the appointment to livings from the crown, from town councils, and from private patrons, to the communicants of the Scotch Church, would open the way for a reconciliation. The old law of patronage was the principal ground on which the Free Churchmen seceded; its repeal seemed the first step towards their re-absorption.

But the Free Church strongly objects to being re-absorbed. Speaking at Jedburgh a few weeks ago, Dr. Rainy, the most powerful, perhaps, of the Free Church leaders, was referring to those friends of the Establishment who said to the Free Churchmen, "You may all come back to us now, we see nothing to hinder you," and a voice in the meeting cried, "Hear." "Ah, very well," said Dr. Rainy, "then my reply is, we are the judges, and not you, as to whether there is anything to hinder us. We have judged very plainly and emphatically. You may think our decision unreasonable; you have a perfect right to think so. But you must take it to be a fact. And you must remember that when an Establishment ceases to command the adherence of large masses of the people, the change in its position is simply a fact to be accepted. The opinion which you entertain that the separation is unreasonable, can do just nothing at all to alter the facts, nor to alter the conclusions to be deduced from them." This is not very encouraging to the authors of schemes for comprehension. In Scotland the first proposal of that sort is firmly declined by the very Church which ecclesiastical politicians might naturally have supposed would listen to their plans with the greatest favour. Nor is this all. The Free Church leaders, instead of being attracted and soothed, are provoked. They regard the policy of comprehension as an insidious attempt to dissolve and to break up their own Church. The Patronage Bill has made them Liberationists. The first attempt at "comprehension" in Scotland is answered by a movement for Disestablishment and Disendowment. In England similar attempts would provoke similar irritation and resentment among the English Nonconformists, and the present antagonism to the Establishment, instead of being alleviated, would be intensified.

What was once the Church of the nation has now practically become the Church of a sect—of a sect which, if we are to reckon only those who regularly attend its services, does not include, in all

probability, more than a fourth of the population. There is no chance of making it anything else than the Church of a sect. The Liberationists maintain that the time for disestablishing it has fully come. Some of the political and general grounds on which we urge this policy, I propose to state as briefly as I can.

We think it a monstrous injustice that a great national institution should be maintained for the advantage of a mere section of the community; we think that the injustice is not diminished by the fact that the persons who receive the benefits conferred by this institution are eminently respectable on account of their rank, their political influence, their wealth, their learning, the excellence of their personal character, and the sincerity and earnestness of their piety. To demonstrate the injustice, it seems hardly necessary to do more than state the facts which illustrate the failure of the Establishment to retain more than a fourth of the people in its communion. To describe its clergy as the national clergy is a courteous but transparent fiction. There is something entertaining in the seriousness with which the clergy assume that the fiction rests on a solid basis of fact. The Bishop of Peterborough appears to have been challenged lately by some gentleman on the manner in which he exercised his episcopal patronage. The Bishop replied that he did not administer his patronage "upon any 'system,' if by that word is understood any fixed routine or order of procedure, as, for instance, that of seniority." In the Bishop's opinion—and he states it with edifying gravity—"the patron is simply a trustee for the spiritual interests of the *parishioners*." "The right of the *parishioners* to the best and fittest pastor that I can find for them is the only vested interest or right that I can recognise in the case."¹ How droll it must all sound to the Nonconformists in the various parishes of his lordship's diocese! His lordship is a trustee for their spiritual interests. They have a right to the best and fittest pastor he can find for them, and that is the only vested interest or right that he can recognise. And when the best or fittest pastor comes, the services and collections in "Bethesda" and "Mount Zion" and "Ebenezer" have to go on just the same as before; and the best and fittest pastor receives eight hundred or a thousand a year for taking charge of the spiritual interests of parishioners, half or two-thirds of whom never pass through the porch of his church. It is the same fiction which dominates the imagination of the clergymen whose speeches I occasionally read in the newspapers, and who make earnest appeals to the public for sympathy and sometimes for help, on the ground that they have charge of twelve thousand, sixteen thousand, and twenty thousand souls. There may be a Roman Catholic bishop in the

(1) The Bishop's letter was published in the *Times* of January 31, 1876.

parish with half a dozen priests residing with him, and a Roman Catholic cathedral with a congregation of a thousand Irish people every Sunday. There may be a Unitarian minister and a hundred of his congregation among the "twenty thousand souls." The parish may be dotted over with Methodist, Baptist, and Independent chapels. There may be three times as many people in the non-established churches on Sunday morning and evening as there are in the parish church. But the tradition of the days when the parish priest was really the priest of the parish, retains its hold upon the mind of the vicar. He cannot look the actual facts of his position in the face. If he did, and if he shaped his language according to them, he would unintentionally become a promoter of the movement for Disestablishment.

Perhaps the best way of bringing home to one's mind the position of the Establishment as a whole is to look at the position of a parochial clergyman. By his own acknowledgment, by his own claims, and by universal consent, it is his duty to provide religious instruction and celebrate religious worship for the whole parish. It is on this ground that he receives his clerical *status* and his clerical income. This is the only explanation of his exceptional position and privileges. But there is a large section of his parishioners to whom he never dreams of offering religious instruction, and to whom he knows it would be useless to give any invitation to unite with him in worship. To them he is a heretic; doctrines and practices which he denounces as "fond things vainly invented, and grounded on no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God," are to them among the most sacred parts of their religion; to them he is a mere imitation priest; and his claims to priestly authority they regard with invincible contempt. There is another section of his parishioners whose minds are finally made up to reject a creed for their rejection of which he menaces them on every great festival of the Church with eternal perdition. There is another section of them who are firmly persuaded that the service he uses in the administration of infant baptism encourages a most pernicious superstition. There is another section who, while agreeing with these in their protest against the service, go further still, and are fully persuaded that infants ought not to be baptized at all.

Can it be imagined that these people can regard with equanimity the presence in the parish of a clergyman who is legally invested with a position which their own ministers cannot claim, who is supported by funds which are declared to be intended to make provision for the spiritual interests of all of them, but whose services they are obliged to decline? Is it to be supposed that they can regard his position as anything else than an injury to themselves? Ought any one to be astonished if they maintain that the property

from which he receives his income is unjustly appropriated? Can a fair-minded statesman, with whatever indifference he may regard the theological differences of the sects, honestly say that these people have not sufficient reason for complaint?

Their case is even stronger than it appears from this statement of it. To say that they derive no advantage from the official who receives an income and a certain status to take charge of their spiritual interests is not enough. They believe that his religious teaching and the religious services which he conducts are in many particulars positively mischievous to the interests which are entrusted to his care. Their objections to the ecclesiastical polity which he represents, or to his teaching, or to his mode of conducting worship, are so strong that they have set up churches of their own. Their grievance is not merely that they receive no benefit from the national arrangements for the promotion of their religious welfare, but that under these arrangements the resources of a national institution and the whole weight of that national authority with which the clergy are invested, are thrown on the side of religious doctrines which they believe to be erroneous, and of an ecclesiastical organization of which they strongly disapprove. Congregationalists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, Unitarians, members of the Society of Friends, Romanists, are all maintaining a creed, a polity, a form of worship to which the State is positively hostile. They are tolerated by the law, but the law covers the country with a clergy charged with the duty of condemning as erroneous what these nonconforming communities hold to be the most sacred truth, and with the duty of defending as true what these communities condemn as false. There is a religious quarrel between the State and half the people who care sufficiently for religious observances to attend public worship with any regularity. The State is on one side; they are on the other. The quarrel is not accidental and temporary. The malcontents have constructed at great cost permanent organizations to assert the various forms of faith and worship to which the State is antagonistic. They have forced the State to tolerate them.

I ask again, Can any statesman imagine that the people outside the ecclesiastical Establishment will feel no sense of wrong? Their grievance is not against the clergy but against the State. Their principles and their traditions lead them to recognise and to respect in others that freedom of religious thought which they claim for themselves; but when the State takes sides with one religious community against them all, they resent it as an injustice.

But the adherents of the "sects" who number a fourth of the population, and the people who go to church who number another fourth, are equalled in number by those who neglect public worship altogether. Of these there are many, no doubt, who think that

religious faith is an excellent thing for mankind generally, that it encourages many virtues which are of great value to society, and is a strong support of social order; but having no faith themselves they doubt whether the institutions of worship would be maintained, especially among the poor, to whom they imagine religion is most necessary, if the State withdrew its aid from the clergy. These persons are favourable to the maintenance of the Establishment as they are favourable to the maintenance of the police. There are others, again—not very many, I imagine—whose faith in the Christian revelation is strong and deep, but whose religious life is solitary and reclusive. They recognise no obligation to unite with others in worship. Those intense religious sympathies, which, apart from any obligation, make common prayer and common praise a necessity and a delight, have never stirred their hearts. But since they see that most men, who have any religious earnestness, have an instinctive longing to unite in public acts of devotion, and appear to derive some benefit or satisfaction from the religious stimulus or instruction of preaching, they think it expedient that there should be a national church. The loose, desultory kind of religious fellowship which exists among the adherents of a national church seems to them the next best thing to absolute religious reserve and solitude. The strong and vital union which binds together the members of most of the “sects” repels them. They are favourable to the maintenance of the Establishment, because while it affords some satisfaction to the social religious instincts it leaves the individual very much alone.

These two classes, however, are very far from exhausting that half of the nation which has renounced or never formed the habit of public worship. There is a considerable number of persons who have consciously abandoned all religious faith. There are, in all probability, still more who while claiming to retain what they describe as religious faith, reject the symbols and creeds of every church commonly recognised as Christian, reject the creed of Mr. Martineau as categorically as they reject the creed of Cardinal Manning. In addition to these, who are positively hostile to the religious ends for which the Establishment exists, there are vast masses who regard these ends with indifference, and whose strength is wholly absorbed in business, in pleasure, or in the common anxieties and sorrows of life. Those who, for whatever reason, desire the Church to be maintained for the sake of other people, though they never attend its services themselves, form, in all probability, an insignificant fraction of that class of the population which I am now considering. It comes therefore to this:—Half of the people attend public worship of some kind, and of these, half refuse to attend the service of the national Church; and the enormous majority of the

remaining half are either actively hostile to the existence of the Establishment or sluggishly indifferent to it.

The injustice of perpetuating the national Church now that it has become the Church of a mere section of the people, is not the only ground on which Liberationists press for Disestablishment. The existence of the national Church provokes religious persecution, and covers religious persecution with what is very naturally regarded as a legal sanction. The State is on the side of the faith and polity of the dominant sect, and, to that extent, is hostile to all other sects. By the encouragement and aid which are given to one church, it does its best to depress and to defeat all other churches. In doing this it employs the authority of law and its power to dispose of public property. Landlords who refuse farms to dissenting tenants may fairly say, that they are only acting in the spirit of the ecclesiastical policy of the nation. The power of the State is used to maintain the Establishment; the power of the landowner may be used just as legitimately for the same purpose. The evil spirit is contagious. How it works was illustrated very lately in a speech delivered, not by a Birmingham agitator, but by the President of the Wesleyan Conference. "He knew cases in which Methodists had had their names placed on the lists of nomination for high civic offices, and their names had been struck out simply on the ground that they were Methodists. On the same ground, also, Methodist farmers had been driven from their farms; and Methodist shopkeepers had been compelled to close their shops, orders having gone forth that nobody was to trade there. He could, within three days, fill sixteen pages of the *Times* newspaper with accounts of oppression of the like kind." The *Watchman*, the weekly organ of the Wesleys, and a newspaper which is well known to be extremely moderate in its political and ecclesiastical principles, sustains these charges in a leading article. "There are very many villages in England," it says, "in which it is impossible to get a bit of land on which to build a chapel; and if a farmer opens his house for a prayer-meeting, or his barn for preaching, he will probably have to leave his farm and all his unexhausted improvements." It is impossible for a Nonconformist minister of any denomination to travel through a rural district of England without hearing innumerable stories of the annoyances and oppression to which his fellow Nonconformists are subjected—annoyances which are often so petty as to provoke contempt rather than anger, oppression sometimes so cruel as to justify fierce indignation.

Religious bigotry will, of course, exist in the absence of an ecclesiastical Establishment. Protestants will be unjust to Roman Catholics, and Roman Catholics to Protestants, the orthodox to heretics, and heretics to the orthodox, though the State may

take no part in the strife. But religious prejudice and zeal appear to have far less to do with the wrongs inflicted on Nonconformists than the spirit of politico-ecclesiastical partisanship. When a landlord tells an applicant for a farm that "it is essential the tenant should be a Churchman, and have £10 an acre of unencumbered capital," he may, perhaps, sometimes be as anxious that the tenant should actually go to church as that the capital should be actually put upon the land; but I hazard very little in saying that in most cases the condition imposed is satisfactorily fulfilled if the tenant keeps away from the village chapel, though he may never enter the village church. The landlord seldom cares very much about making his estate a settlement of Anglican saints; but the Church is one of the institutions of the country; the clergyman is the authorised and official religious teacher of the parish; dissent is insubordination, a revolt against authority; and the same spirit which makes Dissenters worship in the way they think best is very apt to make them vote as they think and not as they are told. Baptists, Congregationalists, Methodists, are at least as zealous for their religious faith as Churchmen; but who has ever seen a letter in which the applicant for a farm was told that "it is essential the tenant should be a Baptist, Congregationalist, Methodist, and have £10 an acre of unencumbered capital"?

The spirit which in favourable circumstances leads to persistent and systematic persecution, has effects of another kind, but hardly less mischievous, where public opinion is too vigilant and Nonconformity too strong for persecution to be possible. I think that Dean Stanley has somewhere said that the Establishment has the advantage of keeping the Church in the main current of the national life. The argument, whoever invented it, is a very favourite one with Broad Churchmen. It is rather a dangerous argument for the friends of the Establishment to handle. It has two edges, and the one which cuts the fingers of the Liberationists is not the sharpest. There is a sense in which it is only too true that Nonconformists have been separated from "the main current of the national life." Their separation is an evil for the nation as well as for themselves. But to ground on this fact an argument for the perpetuation of the Establishment, is a logical audacity which it would be hard to parallel.

Yes, the Nonconformists have lost the advantage of being in the main current of the national life. But why? The Corporation Act excluded them from municipal offices; the Conventicle Act forced them to celebrate their worship in a secrecy as deep as that in which conspirators hatch their plots; the Five Mile Act drove their ministers into solitary parts of the country; the Test Act excluded them from all civil, naval, and military employments. It is not surprising that Churchmen should have one advantage over Non-

conformists—the advantage of having been for two hundred years in the main current of the national life. Nonconformists were excluded from the national universities, and compelled to get what education they could in private academies—situated often in obscure towns—where ten or twenty young men, all of the same religious faith and traditions, received the teaching of one or two learned men who were not likely to know much about the main current of the national life. Even these academies provoked the jealousies or the fears of the dominant sect, and an Act was passed for their suppression. Queen Anne died on the very day the Act was to have come into operation. Never, perhaps, was a political thanksgiving more sincere or more fervent than that which Thomas Bradbury offered in Fetter Lane Chapel that morning. He had met Bishop Burnet in Smithfield before service, and said to the kindly prelate, “I am thinking whether I shall have the constancy and resolution of that noble company of martyrs whose ashes are deposited in this place, for I most assuredly expect to see similar times of violence and persecution, and that I shall be called to suffer in a like cause.” The Bishop told him the Queen was dying, and promised that as soon as she was dead he would send a messenger to Fetter Lane; Bradbury was still preaching when the messenger reached the gallery of the chapel, and dropped the handkerchief from the front gallery, which was to be the sign that the Queen was no more. In the prayer after the sermon, the Nonconformist gave thanks for the deliverance of the nation, and invoked the blessing of God on George I. and the House of Hanover. It is not difficult to explain how it has happened that the Established Church has the inestimable advantage which is claimed for it.

Nor is it any reply to remind us that this happened in 1714, more than a hundred and sixty years ago, and that since the accession of the House of Hanover, the State has pursued a more just and kindly policy. It is true that the worst and most cruel laws enacted in the interest of the national Church were repealed when William III. came to the throne, and that the re-action under the reign of Queen Anne was checked by her death. But the struggle to remove disabilities imposed upon the refusal to conform to the national Church, has lasted down to our own times, and the exclusive spirit has survived exclusive laws. We are still “Two Nations,” and the division will last as long as the Establishment lasts.

The lines which separate the adherents of the privileged Church from the rest of the nation, are not so firm and so strong as they were a generation ago. The provincial spirit on both sides is giving way. Churchmen read the books of Nonconformists; Nonconformists read the books of Churchmen; in the great commonwealth of literature, ecclesiastical prejudices are largely forgotten. The intenser religious earnestness which has been manifested, both inside and

outside the Church, during the last thirty years, if it has added something to the vehemence of theological controversy, has made Christian men of all churches vividly conscious that they have a common faith, common hopes, and a common religious life. Non-conformists who are very vigorous Liberationists do honour to the integrity, the sanctity and the zeal which are found among the clergy of the Establishment; Churchmen who think that the success of the Liberation movement would inflict immeasurable harm upon the country, are equally just and generous to their opponents. It has been discovered that men may be firmly opposed to each other in this controversy, and yet remain hearty friends in private life; that they can dine together, borrow each other's books, discuss the questions at issue between them without heat, and regard each other with cordial affection and esteem.

But, after all, the force of individual influence is powerless against a great national institution. Let one class of the community retain privileges which have ceased to have any justification in the actual condition of the nation, and the possession of privilege will encourage violence and oppression. Let another class be discouraged and wronged and the sense of injury will create distrust and resentment.

Centuries ago it may have been expedient that "the main current of the national life" should be deepened and strengthened by politico-ecclesiastical embankments. This is a theoretical opinion which for the moment I do not care to dispute. Our contention is, that the embankments are now in mid-stream; that instead of improving the political navigation, they make it dangerous; that the river has broken through the old works, and has made a second channel for itself. If there was ever a time when, for the sake of perfecting our national and social unity, it was wise to have a national Church, that time has for ever gone by. The national Church is the occasion of our most angry political conflicts, and of the most mischievous of our social schisms.

Perhaps one of the simplest and most obvious illustrations of the disappearance of all those conditions which may have made a national Church expedient in the earlier periods of our history, is to be found in the present constitution of Parliament. So long as the Church remains national, Parliament must retain its present authority in all ecclesiastical affairs. The ecclesiastical functions of Parliament are an essential element in the constitution of the existing establishment. But an assembly less competent to be entrusted with the government of the Church, it would be difficult for human ingenuity to devise. The answer is that the arrangement exists. If Parliament had not been discharging high ecclesiastical functions for centuries, Dean Stanley himself would hardly venture to maintain

that Parliament was the best of all possible assemblies for administering the affairs of a Church. Even the present Parliament, though largely returned in the interest of the clergy, hardly appears to possess the characteristics and qualifications which we look for in a great ecclesiastical court.

Theoretically, the ecclesiastical functions of Parliament may be indefensible, but are there adequate practical reasons for a change?

The challenge is perfectly fair, and ought to be met. We maintain that Parliament is overtasked, that the House of Commons has neither time nor strength to get through the necessary public business of the nation, and that while important measures like the Merchant Shipping Bill of last session are postponed from year to year, because there is not adequate opportunity for discussing them, it is a great evil that the House should be required to regulate the ecclesiastical affairs of a fourth of the population. The Act for the Regulation of Public Worship, passed in 1874, attracted public attention, and every one knows how many nights it consumed, and how it obstructed general political business. But the number of ecclesiastical measures brought before Parliament every session is very much greater than most people suppose. The number of the ecclesiastical measures which become law, and which therefore get read a first, second, and third time, and pass through committee, is very considerable. In 1871 there was an Act to amend the law relating to ecclesiastical dilapidations; the amending Act was amended in 1872. In 1871 there were also Acts to amend the law relating to the Tables of Lessons and Psalter contained in the Prayer Book; to amend the law relating to sequestration of ecclesiastical benefices; to amend certain Acts relating to church-building; to amend and define the law relating to private chapels belonging to colleges, schools, hospitals, asylums, and other public institutions; and an Act providing for the resignation of clergymen incapacitated for service, and determining their pensions; in the next year there was a similar Act providing for the resignation of deans and canons. In 1872 there was an Act making it illegal for any clerk in orders, parish clerk, vestry clerk, or other persons, to demand fees for baptism, or for the registration of baptism, in certain churches and chapels of the Church of England by law established, the vested rights of the present holders of any office who may be entitled by any Act of Parliament to claim fees being respected. In the same year there was an Act securing the free use of seats in certain churches; an Act amending the Act of Uniformity; and an Act for the alteration of the boundaries of dioceses. In 1873 there was an Act to amend a previous Act, passed in the present reign, for the regulation of cathedrals, and to facilitate the endowment of canonries by private benefactions; an Act for amending the Tithe Commutation Acts with respect to market gardens; and an Act for

amending the Ecclesiastical Commissioners' Acts of 1840 and 1850, and for other purposes. In 1874, in addition to the Public Worship Regulation Act, there was an Act for extending to the present Bishop of Calcutta the regulations of a previous Act relating to the leave of absence of Indian bishops; an Act providing that, except under certain defined conditions, no person ordained by any bishop other than a bishop of the Church of England or Ireland, shall officiate as priest or deacon in any church or chapel in England. In 1875 there was an Act making perpetual an Act passed six years before, providing for the resignation of bishops; an Act for the creation of a new bishopric of St. Albans; and an Act providing for returns relating to ecclesiastical fees, and for other purposes. How many ecclesiastical bills have been before Parliament during the last four or five years, which have been defeated on the second reading, or been extinguished in committee, I have no means at hand for ascertaining; but the *Times* of this very morning (February 17) contains an illustration of the way in which the time of Parliament is consumed by the defeated as well as the successful attempts at ecclesiastical legislation. The debate on Mr. Beresford Hope's bill for the increase of the episcopate extends over four columns; it occupied nearly the whole of an afternoon sitting, and was then practically withdrawn.

Private members are complaining that they have not the chance of getting a day for measures in which their constituents are deeply interested; and in July the Government will announce with profound regret that important bills must be withdrawn because the press of business has made it impossible to find time to discuss them. If a clerk were to spend a couple of hours every day copying music for a church choir when he ought to be copying invoices, he would be just as guilty of robbing his master as if he took money out of the till. The time of Parliament belongs to the nation just as the time of a clerk belongs to the manufacturer who employs him; and the work of the nation suffers, and suffers severely, through the time which Parliament is giving to the ecclesiastical business of a fraction of the people.

There is another reason for relieving Parliament of its present ecclesiastical functions, a reason which to many persons will have great urgency. It is plainly impossible for Parliament to discharge these functions effectively. During the present reign it is probable that at least three hundred public acts relating to ecclesiastical persons and ecclesiastical affairs have become law. But nearly all these measures deal with such matters as church building and church dilapidations; tithes and loans for church purposes; pensions for bishops, deans, and incumbents, who resign their offices; the boundaries of bishoprics, archdeaconries and parishes; fees for ordination, fees for baptism, fees for consecration of churches. Parliament has

not touched, Parliament dare not touch, any of the greater subjects affecting the faith, the discipline, or the worship of the Church. We have a national institution which the nation cannot direct or control. The national ecclesiastical establishment, in all that most deeply affects the religious thought and life of the nation, is still in the hands of the Parliament and bishops of the Restoration. Clarendon, Sheldon, Gunning and Morley are still its rulers.

The case requires to be stated even more strongly. The Church of the Restoration was really the Church of Charles I., of James I., of Elizabeth. The Act of Uniformity of 1662 re-established its polity, its creeds, its articles, its worship, just as they stood a century before. But, during the last three hundred years a great change has passed upon Protestant Christendom. The change amounts to revolution—not in religious faith, but in religious opinion—a revolution which in some of its aspects is quite as grave as that which divided western Christendom in the seventeenth century. Orthodox Protestant theologians retain the substance of the creed of the Reformers, but the definitions of nearly all the principal articles of that creed have been re-cast. The method of theology has been gradually modified, and whenever there is modification of scientific method there will be modifications of scientific results. Contrast the sermons, the theological treatises, the commentaries, produced by every school in the English Church during the Carolinian and Elizabethan periods, with the books written by theologians of every school in the English Church in our own time, and it will be obvious that English theology has not escaped from the influences by which the theology of continental Protestantism has been transformed. Evangelicals do not write about free will, original sin, and the atonement, in the way in which the Calvinistic reformers in the reign of Elizabeth wrote about the same doctrines. The Evangelicals write in another way because they think in another way. Broad Churchmen stand on different ground altogether from that on which the Latitudinarians of the seventeenth century stood, and even if it were not so, Latitudinarianism had nothing to do with shaping the Book of Common Prayer. The High Anglicans and Ritualists approach, no doubt, very near to the position of the Laudian divines; but the divines of the sixteenth century, to whom we owe the Prayer Book, would have regarded both Laud and the Ritualists with dismay and horror.

The authoritative documents of the English Church are the expression of a condition of religious life and thought which has altogether passed away. The various elements which were blended in the religious faith and feeling of the men who drew up these documents or compiled them from materials already in existence, are now divided among hostile theological parties. The Evangelical may

conscientiously believe that the offices of the Church can be satisfactorily explained; the Ritualist may conscientiously believe that the Articles can be satisfactorily explained away. It would be unjust to lay a moral indictment against the men of either party; to their own Master they stand or fall. Among the Evangelicals and among the Ritualists there are men to whose personal honour and integrity it would be an impertinence for me to bear testimony. But it remains true that the Articles are the expression of the Reformation theology which the Ritualists abhor, and that the Offices are stained with those Romish superstitions which the Evangelicals hold to be infinitely perilous to the spiritual interests of mankind. Nor do those who walk in middle paths, those represented by the late Bishop of Winchester and the late Dean Hook, reproduce the precise type of faith and the precise religious temper which created the Prayer Book. The book, as a whole, is very unlike the ancient creeds which are contained in it. The creeds were the expression of a coherent and tolerably complete theological movement, the results of which are permanently absorbed in the theological thought of Christianity,—a movement deriving a real unity from the life which inspired it, and of which it was the organic manifestation. But the Prayer Book was a premature though necessary attempt to reconcile conflicting forces. It arrested the disappearance and decay of the old modes of thought; it arrested the free development of the new. What the Prayer Book was in the days of Elizabeth it is now. The Church, the nation, has grown in many ways; the formularies which profess to contain the highest thought of both the nation and the Church remain unchanged. What is more serious still, while the Establishment lasts there is no power which can change them.

These facts are, I venture to think, of very serious significance to the loyal and devout adherents of the national Church. They are also of very serious significance to the nation generally. So long as Parliament refuses to surrender its present ecclesiastical functions, the incoherence of the formularies of the Church will remain without a remedy; and this incoherence will continue to inflict upon the country evils from which it has suffered too long. Ecclesiastical parties will continue to exchange bitter recriminations. They will continue to call each other traitors. They will continue to denounce each other as men who eat the bread of the Church and are false to its principles. The interpretation which is put upon quarrels of this kind by people who know nothing of the subtleties of theological controversy is very simple, very unjust, very mischievous; they conclude that the adherents of one party, at least—perhaps of both—are consciously dishonest. The effect on the morality of the country is in the highest degree disastrous. The only cure is for Parliament to renounce the functions which it is

powerless to discharge, and to remit to the clergy and laity of the Church the management of their own affairs.

This paper would extend far beyond its necessary limits if I attempted to discuss the pleas which are urged on the other side; they must be dismissed in a few sentences.

There is first the plea that to disestablish the Church would be to create an independent religious corporation, possessing such enormous power and such enormous wealth that it would be a permanent menace to the State. At present, however, as I have already said, there is no such corporation as the Church of England. To provide for the creation of such a corporation in an Act of Disestablishment does not seem an imperative necessity; and under what conditions a free episcopal Church should be legally incorporated is an open question. To make any such provision for the re-endowment of the English Church as was made in the Act of 1869 for the re-endowment of the Irish Church would, I believe, be contrary to all principles of sound policy; the State would discharge its duty by providing for the ample recognition of the vested rights of the clergy individually. Why a disestablished Church, if incorporated, should give more trouble to statesmen than the present established Church I cannot understand. There is no reason to suppose that the clergy would act with greater unanimity in political contests than at present, or with a more exclusive regard to Church interests. Their political authority and their motives for engaging in political struggles would be diminished.

A second plea is, that a disestablished and disendowed Church would be unable to provide for the maintenance and encouragement of theological learning. It is alleged that the theological literature produced by Nonconformists is greatly inferior to that produced by the clergy of the National Church; and that, as a class, the clergy are far more scholarly than the Nonconformist ministers. There would be much more force in this allegation if Nonconformists had not been excluded till very lately from the rewards and honours of the national universities, and if they were not excluded still from many of the positions which are appropriated to men who have won university distinction.

But whatever neglect of theological learning can be charged against the Nonconformists of the present century is the result of very obvious causes. We have many cultivated and able men, many accomplished and refined women, in our churches, but we have worked, for the most part, among the poor and the uneducated. Both in the great towns and in the rural districts, we have collected our congregations from among those whom the National Church had permitted to sink into the grossest ignorance and irreligion. "The common people" have heard us gladly. The rapidity with which, early in this century, we formed church after church in every

part of the kingdom compelled us to disregard the traditions which we had inherited from our fathers—traditions which affirmed the necessity of a learned ministry. We found that devout and zealous men who had native intellectual vigour and native force of character often became very efficient preachers and pastors, though they had little Latin, less Greek, and no Hebrew. To have refused to entrust such men with ministerial responsibilities would have been to leave innumerable congregations without any minister at all. There was no time to give them an elaborate education. Many of them came to us too late in life for an elaborate education to be of any service to them. We did our best to give them some knowledge of theological science and some knowledge of how to preach, and some of them became not only good preachers but great preachers, and did a work which the most accomplished Christian scholars might envy. Gradually we raised the Academies established by our predecessors in evil times into Colleges; and in parts of the country where no Academies existed, new colleges were founded. Our people have shown a noble generosity in establishing these institutions for the education of their ministers; but it must be acknowledged that our educational arrangements are still very defective. They could hardly have been made otherwise. We have done what we could.

It must also be acknowledged that while some of our laity appreciate the importance of theological learning, the great majority, in all probability, do not. Vast numbers of them have had a most imperfect education. Through the virtues which they have learned to practise since they came to us, many of them have become rich; but they have not been able to escape from the effects of their early disadvantages. They cannot be persuaded to tolerate a dull preacher simply because he is learned. As yet we have comparatively few positions for men who wish to give their whole life to scholarship. With all this, the intellectual activity and earnestness of Non-conformist ministers and their general culture—I do not speak of their technical scholarship—give them a claim to the respect of the community. Nor are we without men whose learning is both extensive and exact.

But if *we* have failed—we who have been excluded from the universities, we who have worked among the poor and among the less educated of the middle classes, we who have been under the strain and stress which have come upon us from the very triumphs we have won among the irreligious masses of the people—if *we* have failed in the cultivation of theological learning, is it reasonable to fear a similar failure in a church starting with such traditions and with such advantages as would belong to the disestablished Church of England? Would the laity of that Church be insensible to the advantages of theological scholarship? Would the clergy of that Church receive no opportunities for acquiring it? Would there be

no canonries, no deaneries, no professorships for the Lightfoots, and the Westcotts, and the Liddons, and the Puseys of the generation which followed disestablishment? The fear seems to me unworthy of the descendants of the illustrious scholars and theologians whose names are the glory of the Anglican Church.

Those who argue that the Establishment should be maintained for the sake of the cultivation of learning, will probably find it difficult to show that the Establishment has really done as much as is sometimes assumed, either for the diffusion of general scholarship or the advancement of theological investigation. Since the beginning of the present century, at least, the universities of Germany have been the theological teachers of Europe. Within that period the Anglican Church has had a few great names—some of the greatest are the names of living men; but both the Churchmen and the Nonconformists of this country will acknowledge that the services which English scholars have rendered to theology during the last fifty years do not admit of comparison with the services which have been rendered by the scholars of Germany. It should be remembered, too, that whatever culture may distinguish the English clergy, they have been educated by the universities, not by the Establishment. The universities will remain when the Church is disestablished. And the universities have done at least as much as the Establishment—probably much more—for the creation of a valuable theological literature. Professor Lightfoot has not been diverted from his theological pursuits by his appointment to a canonry of St. Paul's; but he would not have abandoned them if the canonry had never been conferred upon him. Dr. Ellicott left off writing commentaries when he was made a bishop.

A third plea in defence of the Establishment rests upon the assumption that if the Church were disestablished a large proportion of the population would be left without the institutions of religious instruction and worship, and would soon relapse into vice and irreligion. The poorer districts of great towns would, it is alleged, be worse off than they are now, and the spiritual condition of the villages would become desperate.

But what justification of these gloomy apprehensions can be produced? Looking back upon the last hundred and fifty years, there seems to me to be the clearest proof that, for some reason or another, the Anglican Church has far less religious power over the poor than any of the sects that profess the evangelical creed. It is among the poor that the sects have acquired their principal strength; they have acquired it with resources which originally were absolutely contemptible when compared with the resources of the Establishment; they have acquired it notwithstanding the persistent and bitter persecution which has been inflicted on Dissenters by a very large section of the Established clergy and their friends.

If the adverse influence of the Establishment were out of the way, the Nonconformists would probably do more for the poor than ever. The clergy of the disestablished Church would probably do at least as much as they are doing now. In the towns a considerable part of the work which the clergy are already doing in the poorest districts has been originated within the last thirty years by voluntary zeal, and is largely maintained by endowments which have been received within the same period from voluntary benevolence. Recent endowments from voluntary sources the disestablished Church ought to retain, and it is certain that Disestablishment will be favourable instead of adverse to the enterprise and generosity of Churchmen. It is about the rural districts that the defenders of the Establishment have the greatest fear. But if the Church has any real faculty for exercising religious influence on the agricultural poor, surely the Church can maintain the ground which it already holds in rural districts; for the ground which the Nonconformists now hold in these districts has been won by a desperate struggle against the prejudice and hostility of the people on whom tenants are dependent for their farms, village shopkeepers for custom, and agricultural labourers for their weekly wages. The Nonconformists have drawn together their congregations and built their chapels in the villages, with no other local aid than they could obtain from ploughmen and thrashers, the village grocer or baker, and perhaps a small farmer who was fortunate enough to own the few acres which he cultivated or to have a Liberal nobleman for his landlord. The clergyman has the large farmers to look to, and the squire, and all the great county people in the neighbourhood. If, after the Church has been in possession for three centuries, these wealthy and powerful classes will not find money to support it, the Church must have flagrantly wasted its great opportunities. I believe that they will support it. The Free Church of Scotland, within thirty years after its Exodus, had an income which was nearly twice as large as the income which the Established Church received from the State. English Churchmen are far wealthier than the adherents of the Scotch Free Church. It is surely a calumny to say that their religious zeal is less fervent, or their liberality less generous.

The fourth plea for letting things alone is the plea of politicians. We are told sometimes that it is idle to contend that the majority of the people are wronged by the ecclesiastical policy of the State, for only a minority are agitating for a change, and that until the agitation becomes more general there is no necessity to pay much attention to the agitators. It would be just as reasonable to reply to an argument intended to illustrate the injustice of slavery by alleging that there were no signs of the outbreak of a servile war. Slavery is an injustice whether the slaves resent it or not. In the actual circumstances of the English people the preservation of the Esta-

blishment is an injustice whether those who are wronged by it resent it or not. But the revolt has begun, and even politicians—to say nothing of statesmen—must make up their minds as to how they will meet it.

The reasons why it did not begin earlier and has not spread more rapidly are almost too clear to need explicit statement. Two centuries have not passed by since Nonconformists were oppressed and harassed by an elaborate system of persecuting laws. To the men who at the cost of a Revolution had obtained the repeal of statutes which punished Nonconformity with fine, imprisonment, and exile, the disadvantages and penalties still inflicted upon them for their separation from the national Church appeared so inconsiderable compared with those from which they had escaped, that they were unwilling to risk what they had gained by attempting to gain more. When Nonconformists were no longer afraid that toleration would be withdrawn, it was only natural that their first movements for a larger liberty should be directed to the repeal of particular statutes passed in comparatively recent times for the repression of Nonconformity. It is also true, no doubt, that the great body of the early Nonconformists were under the control of those ancient traditions which made it the first duty of the civil magistrate to care for the honour and maintenance of religion. The actual form of religion which the magistrate happened to be maintaining was in their judgment very objectionable; but to most of them a State which made no provision for religious teaching and worship would have been as strange and startling a spectre as a School Board which makes no provision for religious teaching and worship appears to be to many of their descendants. What they wanted was a State Church with a Conscience Clause.

They, therefore, gradually plucked up courage to agitate against Dissenting grievances. The agitation for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, for the right to celebrate marriages in their own places of worship, for the abolition of Church rates, and for admission to the Universities—these were the movements which till recently tasked all their strength. And though for more than a generation large numbers of Nonconformists have felt that by the maintenance of the Establishment the State inflicted injustice upon themselves, and impaired rather than strengthened the authority of religious faith in the nation generally, their resentment against the greater wrong has concentrated itself and has worked itself off in the struggle against inferior grievances. These have now nearly disappeared, and before long the Nonconformists will inevitably unite their forces for the supreme contest. The development of Ritualism is kindling excitement in many who have been indifferent to the Liberation Movement till now, and is raising the zeal of some of the older Liberationists to a white heat. The fire is certain to spread and spread fast.

The line of defence which is assumed by those who have undertaken the defence of the Establishment is forcing the controversy in a direction which must interest and attract all those who care nothing for ecclesiastical theories, and who have hitherto regarded the Liberation dispute as a more sectarian quarrel. Of late years the masses of the people have not clearly understood that the clergy of the Church of England are the national clergy. They have cared too little either for Church or Dissent to appreciate the difference between the relations of the parochial clergyman and the relations of the Methodist minister to the State. The Church has practically become a sect, and the people have forgotten that it is still a national institution. The defenders of the Establishment just now seem to have forgotten it too. They are asserting that the property which gives a revenue to the clergy is the property of Churchmen in the same sense in which Methodist chapels are the property of Methodists. The Liberationists are, therefore, compelled in reply to give great prominence to the national character of the Church, and to the right of the nation to appropriate Church property to other than ecclesiastical uses. In answer to the inquiry, incessantly but most unwisely reiterated by the friends of the Establishment, about the manner in which it is proposed that ecclesiastical property should be disposed of, the Liberationists recommend that the property should be vested in local authorities, and the income devoted to purposes in which all parishioners and burgesses have a common interest. This is an appeal for disestablishment which comes home to men who care nothing for controversies between the Churches. Let me say frankly that the appeal is one for which I have no great liking. It would be infinitely better that the controversy should be slowly determined by large political and religious considerations than that it should be brought—as it is likely to be brought—to a rapid issue by the eagerness of vast masses of the people to use Church property for their own advantage. But when Liberationists are charged with recommending a policy of robbery and spoliation, they cannot submit to the slander quietly. They are bound to show that the nation has as much right to determine how the great mass of Church property should be appropriated as it has to determine the appropriation of the Consolidated Fund. The idea has begun to take hold of the popular mind. It is an idea which is likely to awaken popular passion—passion which, if it becomes hot, may refuse to listen to the claims of generosity and even to the claims of justice. The friends of the clergy, and all who desire to see an equitable settlement of this controversy, would do wisely to consent to a settlement before the great towns of the kingdom and the people in rural parishes who are complaining bitterly of the pressure of the rates, become too vehemently eager to secure the ecclesiastical revenues for the maintenance of schools or the relief of the poor.

R. W. DALE.

THE UPPER ENGADINE.

“Te flagrantis atrox hora Caniculæ
Nescit tangere; tu frigus amabile
Præbes.”

THE crowd of visitors that spend the summer in the Upper Engadine is continually increasing. Many of them return thither more or less regularly; and nearly all retain some interest in the place and its inhabitants. As I am myself probably the most regular of all the visitors—going to the Engadine each year, and staying there, as a rule, from June till November—it may be possible for me to give some information not unacceptable to those for whom St. Moritz already has an attraction, nor perhaps to those who may intend shortly to visit it for the first time. It is, however, hard to mention all that is needful for the latter class of readers, without stating much that must seem superfluous to the former class. Moreover, St. Moritz being mainly frequented as a health-resort, some account must be given of its climate and iron-waters; and the materials for such an account, being in our case wholly derived from our experience and that of others, and from the statements of experts, have no foundation whatever in medical knowledge of our own. Hence our remarks on this head will be useful only as a reminder to those delicate persons who, before going to St. Moritz, have inquired of the best medical authorities; that is, of medical men who, like Dr. Yeo and Dr. Hermann Weber, have made St. Moritz their special study. But very many invalids seek the mountain-cure without taking this precaution; and mischievous results sometimes follow from the wild notions current about the Engadine, and even from the advice of physicians who have not been there. On the whole, therefore, the difficulty of being all things to all readers must be our excuse if, in any instance, we be thought either to poach on the manor of the doctors, or to give a *crambe repetita* of Murray.

Mr. Freshfield, who is certainly no flatterer of the Upper Engadine, affirms that its climate is “the most bracing south of the Arctic Circle.”¹ The statement, however, needs qualification. There are isolated hotels on various spots among the Alps (such as Mürren, Belalp, Eggischorn, and St. Gothard) where the air is little, if at all, less cold—there are hotels on the Riffel and on the Furca and Stelvio passes, where the air is much colder—than in the neighbourhood of any hotel or hospice in the Engadine. Never-

(1) “Italian Alps.”

theless, none of these spots comes anywhere near the Engadine as a bracing place for invalids; for none of them furnishes the same civilised comforts. The Engadine—with its very accessible position and excellent roads, with its numerous and good hotels, with its supply of doctors throughout the year (of one or more English doctors generally during the season), and with its chemist's shop (the highest in Europe)—defies all comparison on the part of any of the places I have named. Also, among cold places it is distinguished by the dryness of the air, and by the number of its bright days. Moreover, the extent of the valley gives great opportunities for enjoying a change of scene; and this is an advantage in more ways than one. An invalid (in the widest sense of the word) who has succeeded in clambering up to one of the solitary mountain hotels of which I have spoken, is likely soon to get tired of his seclusion, and to want to go elsewhere. But he will probably be unable to dip by halves. He must plunge at once into a low valley, and thus pass suddenly from coolness to heat, and from a rare air to a dense air. In the Engadine, on the other hand, he may avoid these trying changes. For, in the first place, this long valley, with its numerous villages and its manifold variety, has attractions which may well detain him till the summer heat is quite over. It has, moreover, what may be termed a graduated scale of bracingness; for, as will be seen presently, it contains at least one Hospice where the air is much more bracing than at St. Moritz, and very much more so than at Samaden. And, secondly, when the Engadine is left, the descent to the low ground may be broken by a stay of a night or two at one of the villages (such as Mühlen or Tiefenkasten) between St. Moritz and Chur. It should be added that there appears to be no place at all like St. Moritz, on the Pyrenees or on any other European range; and that—to judge by the number of Americans who come to the Engadine, and by the information with which some of them have favoured me—there is no such place in America. Hence, from the point of view of those delicate persons who can bear, and who require, bracing *ad libitum*, the Upper Engadine may be described as the summer resort of the world; it is without an equal anywhere, and, for Englishmen at least, without a second.¹

" (1) Davos, the only other place where the various requirements of a summer resort are in any degree combined, is, in every one of them, inferior to the Engadine. It has, further, what our countrymen would find a great drawback—its hotels are almost exclusively filled with Germans; and the passion of Germans for shutting all windows is most trying to Englishmen (especially invalids), and is perpetually the cause of disputes. Wherever Englishmen and Germans meet in hotels these disputes arise. Sometimes, in defence of *fainting* ladies, Englishmen are driven to break windows with their elbows; and I am assured that, three years ago, at a German watering-place, one of the disputants so far forgot himself as to knock his antagonist down. Even at the

We may well be amazed that a place thus utterly unique should appear so completely to have dropped out of the tourist's map, that many English travellers who visited the Alps some twenty years ago, not merely never saw the Engadine, but never so much as heard of it. It was not always thus unknown. The Romans are said to have used the iron-waters. I heard an accomplished archaeologist maintain that the victory which was won by Tiberius and Drusus in the Rhætian Alps, and which Horace has celebrated in two of his finest odes, must have taken place in the Engadine. The end of the valley near the Maloja Pass might well have served for a battle-field; but I am aware that the actual site of the battle is generally placed further east. At any rate, the Engadine lay in the Rhætian Alps; and with that entire district the Romans were familiar. At Chur (Curia Rhætorum), there is a tower in the Bishop's palace, which is held to be Roman. The village of Bivio (Bivium) on the road to St. Moritz is so called from its marking the point where the roads over the Julier and Septimer passes meet.¹ The Septimer pass was much used by the Romans; and traces are still left of the Roman road. To this day, the language of the people is Romansch, which is commonly described as a mixture of Italian and German, but which is in truth a Latin dialect.² It, however, contains a few foreign ingredients; amongst others, an ingredient of Spanish, left by the Spaniards during their occupation of Milan and the Valteline. It should be added that some Engadiners have Spanish blood in them, and that in a few cases the Spanish type of countenance is strongly marked. This is a most impressive fact. In a late number of this Review, Professor Tyndall called attention to the singular phenomenon, that the vibrations of "invisible music" can be transmitted

St. Moritz *Kulm*, where the English are predominant, matters are quite bad enough. It was there contemplated to put the English near the windows in the dining-room, and to separate the Germans from them by a screen. Surely such an arrangement, however unsocial, would be wise. If the English and their excellent kinsmen are so prone to quarrel at watering-places, is it not better that, like Abraham and Lot, they should keep asunder?

(1) It is a curious instance of the inconvenience arising from the conflict of languages in this neighbourhood, that the Italians and the Swiss respectively call the same village by the wholly unlike names of Bivio and Stalla. Some authorities affirm that the word *Julier* is derived, not from Julius Cæsar, but from a local name. Still, the word, if not Latin in its origin, is Latinised in its present form; and its history may be compared with that of the word *Maleventum* (originally derived from the Greek). On the top of the Julier pass are two pillars without any legible inscription, but probably either of Roman or præ-Roman date. Is it possible that these pillars, if they cannot be a last vestige, may mark the site, of the *arces Alpibus impositæ tremendis* which Drusus demolished?

(2) Mr. Tylor has kindly called my attention to the fact that the Romansch word *cudesch*, a book, comes directly from the Latin *codex*, and not from any Italian word. He has also favoured me with the beginning of the Romansch national hymn, which resembles Latin so closely that it might almost be given to schoolboys as a specimen of bad Latin for correction.

through a silent rod. It is a yet more stupifying thought, that in the Engadine the *δύναμις* of the Spanish physiognomy has been unwittingly passed from generation to generation—passed, perhaps through a single line of descent, certainly in spite of numerous inter-marriages with a most un-Spanish race—passed, in at least one instance, by a parent in whom personally the Spanish physiognomy does not appear. So that, though now the Spanish occupation is long since over and forgotten, and is unsuspected even by some who bear the impress of it in their features, still the old Spaniards, being dead, yet speak; *atque, ut cursores, vitai lumpada tradunt.*

At the time of the Reformation, the Engadiners espoused the new faith, and offered a brave resistance to the Catholics around. The old Protestant Church of St. Moritz was one of the very southernmost churches of the Reformation; Luther is said to have preached in it. About this period, an event occurred which ultimately worked a complete change in the history of the valley. Paracelsus of Hohenheim discovered (or, some say, rediscovered) the more powerful of the two iron-springs, which now bears his name; and, in 1539, he wrote an account of the iron-waters. In regard to the earlier use of these waters there is much obscurity, and that for a characteristic reason. "It is not improbable that other records of the ancient use of the springs may have existed in the archives of the commune, but it happened that, some time ago, the then President, who, in addition to his municipal duties, also dealt in groceries and small wares, thought the old official books and papers would make excellent wrappers for sugar and soap, and disposed of them accordingly."¹ In the year 1614, the Engadiners took a sudden fancy for travelling.² A large number of them—it is said, several thousands, which must have amounted to a complete exodus—emigrated to North Italy, chiefly to Venice, all adopting the single business of shoemaking. They continued this occupation for a century and a half; till, in 1766, their exclusion from Venice forced them to abandon it. Still, however, they formed a sort of guild, and stuck to a single trade; but the trade was a dissimilar one: from cobblers they all became pastrycooks.³ They were soon the first pastrycooks in Europe; and, to this day, in almost all Continental countries, many of the best pastrycooks' shops are in the hands of Engadiners. But they never penetrated to the British Isles, and this may be one reason why, till within the last few years, our countrymen have been so exceptionally

(1) Pole's "Iron Cure among the Glaciers."

(2) Many of the following facts are derived from "Das Engadin und die Engadiner," an anonymous work written in 1837, seemingly by a German pastor.

(3) As the German pastor phrases it, they took to selling pastry, and other such dainties "as tickle the gums." In several of the neighbouring districts, nearly all the inhabitants are brought up to a single trade; amongst others in Val Bregaglia, whence they emigrate as chimney-sweepers.

ignorant about them. It is said that the old editions of Murray's *Guide* have little information to give about St. Moritz, except that the Protestant church contained the fire-engine. One cause—which was also a sign—of the prevalent want of interest in the Engadine may have been the badness of the roads. Those who know the valley as it is now, may be amused to learn that, as late as forty years ago, it was thought safer to ride than to drive over the pass, and that any stray visitor who might come for the sake of the mineral waters was advised to keep a horse of his own; if the horse was not used to the fare of black bread, oats had to be brought from Chur, as there were few or none in the valley. The post came only once a week, and then only to Ponte; every Thursday, when the weather permitted, the visitors at St. Moritz made an expedition to that distant village, and returned home with their letters.

In this primitive state of society, and in the jealousy and dislike of intruders, the Engadiners were not wholly unlike the Japanese; and withal in the Engadine, as in Japan, the irrepressible foreigner has appeared, and the nineteenth century has followed close on the Middle Ages. At the present day, St. Moritz is easily reached from Chur by either of two excellent roads of about equal length, one over the Albula, the other over the Julier, pass. The former of these roads is often preferred as being grander near the top of the pass. But the Julier road has the great advantage of giving a better first impression of the Engadine. By this route the traveller is at once brought *in medias res*. As he comes down from the pass, he has a fine view of the main valley with its lakes and villages; and on his arrival at Silva Plana he has the opportunity of examining in detail one of the most characteristic of those villages. In many respects the Engadine villages resemble those in other parts of the Grisons. The houses have a half-Italian look; they are solidly built; and, with their frequently renewed coat of whitewash, they present a strong contrast to the dark wooden *châlets* which abound in many parts of Switzerland.¹ Thus far the Oberhalbstein and the Engadine villages are alike. What is peculiar to the latter is a kind of patch-work appearance. The small sunk windows are being replaced by large modern ones; modern doorways, too, are beginning to be substituted for the wide-arched doorways through which carts and sledges are admitted into the primitive entrance-halls, which serve both as coach-houses and as barns; and some of the ancient cottages have the air of being refurbished to delight the eyes of visitors.

When I spoke of the half-Italian look of the villages, I was partly referring to the tall slender campaniles, whose summit is not quite

(1) Mr. Freshfield has well remarked that: "In their passion for whiteness and cleanness, fresh paint and bright flowers, and, I may add, in a certain slow persistency of character, the Eastern Swiss seem to me the Dutch of the mountains."

that of Italian campaniles, but which are more akin to these than to anything else.¹ A good number of these campaniles may be seen during the ascent from Chur; and it is worth while making that ascent on a Sunday morning, in order to witness the hearty devotion that prevails, at least among the women, and especially, I think, among the Catholics. In part of the Grisons, the valleys take it almost in turns to be Catholic and Protestant; and between the Catholics and Protestants there is no friendly feeling. An Engadiner told me that the Protestants of St. Moritz dislike taking even a maid from the Catholic Tiefenkasten; for the Catholics are thought to have "Jesuitical notions of morality." On a ridge, within sight of Tiefenkasten, stands one of the most picturesque of the churches, the Catholic church of Brienz. Nearly all the village has lately been burnt down—a fate not uncommon among the older and less substantially built villages of the Grisons. But, happily, the church is left; and, on its conspicuous height, it looked last year all the more impressive, from its being in solitary grandeur among the ruins. The Catholics, we may be sure, never imitated the Protestant economy by using churches as engine-houses; and I have sometimes thought how triumphantly their controversialists at Brienz must appeal to "the God who answereth by fire," and who spared his undesecrated sanctuary when he was consuming the rest of the village. A small chapel near the neighbouring village of Lenz is described by an old tradition as the scene of a very different deliverance. A peasant, some centuries ago, was leading a kid past this chapel, and, being called away for a few minutes, he tied the kid to the handle of the door. During his absence a wolf attacked the kid, which thereupon in its struggles pushed against the door; the door, opening inwards, let the kid into the chapel; whither, however, the wolf followed. With the courage of despair, the kid jumped over the wolf through the doorway; and thereby, being still tethered, shut the door on its assailant. So the man, on his return, found his kid still safe outside the chapel, and the wolf a prisoner within. It is feared that the captive's right of sanctuary was straightway disregarded.

Perhaps the most surprising feature in many Grisons villages is the wrought ironwork, which often shows great artistic skill, and which contrasts strangely with the otherwise homely exterior of the houses. Some of this ironwork is full two hundred years old; and its present state of preservation is a noteworthy proof of the extreme

(1) In some of these church-towers there are old clocks which strike the hour twice with an interval of a few minutes, in order to facilitate the counting of the strokes. This assistance is not of much use at St. Moritz, as the clock is almost invariably wrong. What at St. Moritz makes the effect most singular is, that this clock is on the Protestant church, and that the Catholic church is hard by. One's first impression was that one heard the stroke of two clocks, the Catholic and the Protestant, both of them much behind the right time, but the Protestant somewhat the less behindhand of the two.

dryness of the air. In a few houses, it is the knockers that attract attention; these represent dragons and other fantastic forms, and hardly any two knockers are alike. But the most striking specimens of the ironwork are the curiously and variously wrought gratings outside the windows. Of the original object of these gratings, the Engadiners give random and discordant accounts. It is variously stated that they were put up by peaceful citizens for protection against robbers, and by jealous husbands for the incarceration of their wives. A pleasanter, and perhaps truer, explanation of the iron grating is, that it was designed as a barrier, behind which a girl might be permitted, without peril of elopement, to talk to her sweetheart, who stood outside. At first sight, this notion seems refuted by the character of the Engadiners. *Ils sont froids, comme leur climat*, was said to me by one who did not love them; and certainly their unromantic temperament would be as little suited as the coldness of their air to the fashion of nocturnal serenades.

From noting the features common to the different villages, we pass on to the distinguishing characteristics of a few of them, so as to enable the reader to judge of their comparative merits; and, that our inquiry may assume a practical shape, let us ask: Whither should our supposed traveller, whom we left at Silva Plana, now direct his steps? If, being content with homely fare, he wishes to see the most picturesque, and one of the most primitive, of Engadine villages, he should visit Sils Maria; where he will find many pleasant excursions, and be within easy reach of the Fex glacier. But, in fact (unless he prefers abiding in his present comfortable quarters at Silva Plana), he will almost certainly take the opposite road—bewareing, however, if he be an Englishman, of the Germanized Kurhaus. At this point, much may be said in favour of Campfer and Samaden, with their excellent hotels. But the air of these villages is less bracing than that of St. Moritz; and the view is less fine than that either at St. Moritz or at Pontresina. On the whole, these last-named villages are by far the most popular in the Engadine. Pontresina is the more central for excursions, and has become the headquarters for guides. St. Moritz is the chief resort of persons more or less delicate.¹ Perhaps we may best sum up our comparison

(1) The *Krone* at Pontresina has long been the favourite hotel of the Alpine club. Their constancy is partly due to their strong personal regard for the landlord and his family. A similar cause has contributed to the immense success of the Kulm Hotel at St. Moritz—the most popular, and, as I think, the most deservedly so, in the Engadine. Both these hotels are scenes of unremitting attention on occasions when such attention is most needed, as the numerous delicate persons who have been at St. Moritz, and the one or more climbers who are annually laid up at Pontresina, because much mountaineering has made them cripples, will gratefully acknowledge. The Kulm Hotel is situated, as its name implies, on the ridge—the highest and driest point—of the main valley. It has one great advantage peculiar to itself—a covered arcade, where, on wet days, people can walk, enjoying the air and the view. Why the new hotels have no such mountain cloister I cannot conceive.

of the different villages, by saying that the division of labour which has arisen between them, and which has adapted each to its special function, should by all means continue. Let athletic mountaineers keep to the easterly villages—Pontresina and Samaden; invalids to the westerly villages—St. Moritz, Campfer, and Silva Plana. One thing, at any rate, is clear. Athletes are of all men the most likely to be irritated by the victimized air and frequent grumblings of invalids; while invalids, if not reminded of their own weakness by the jarring vicinity of exuberant strength, at least object to their wakeful slumbers being broken by heavy footsteps, to the midnight knock at their neighbour's door, and to the other vicarious penalties of mountaineering. Thus athletes and invalids are only an eyesore to each other, and had better live in separate hotels.

We do not, however, mean that invalids and non-invalids should keep asunder in the Engadine, as some Englishmen and some Germans should keep asunder. Happily, mankind is not made up wholly of athletes and invalids. There is a large class of middlemen—of persons, that is, neither very strong nor very weak—who have points in common with both the extremes, and whose presence at health-resorts is invaluable. A person of this kind—one who can be thus touched with the feeling of infirmities—is the best possible companion for nervous sufferers. Indeed, it is he alone who can keep them from becoming victims either to solitary brooding, or to each other's society and a dolorous exchange of confidences, or, far worst of all, to the clumsy and disdainful exhortations and the spurious and odious attempts at sympathy of prigs who do not know what nervousness is. Philanthropy, therefore, should incline the half-invalid towards the delicate region of the valley—the region on the side of St. Moritz. But probably, in fact, his movements will be determined by what he likes in the way of scenery, and in the way of air. On the former point each person must judge for himself. It may be said roughly that the view from St. Moritz is a lake view, and that the view from Pontresina is a glacier view; and, if I personally prefer the view from St. Moritz, my preference is doubtless owing to some of the accidental, often fanciful, associations which regulate that most capricious of tastes—taste for mountain scenery. The comparative worth of the two villages as bracing resorts admits of a more accurate measurement. Pontresina is sometimes preferred in this respect, on the ground of its having close to it an enormous natural refrigerator in the shape of the Rosegg glacier. St. Moritz, it is true, has also a glacier in sight, the Surlei glacier, which is so called from its being over the lake, and which, Cassandras tells us, will one day, from its present rickety height, fall bodily on the Kurhaus—not perhaps to the great dissatisfaction of lovers of Alpine beauty. But this glacier is so

small and so isolated—standing as it does on the top of its dark mountain, like a solitary sugar-plum on the top of a cake—that, while it adds little to the scenery of St. Moritz, it certainly makes no appreciable addition to its cold. The appearance of the Rosegg glacier from Pontresina is far more striking; and this village is often assumed to be more bracing than St. Moritz by reason of its nearness to that glacier and to the Morteratsch. It is probable that these huge glaciers perceptibly affect the temperature of the comfortable little *restaurants*, or small inns, near their respective bases; and, therefore, these *restaurants* make excellent quarters for a person, especially a glacier climber, who finds his own society enough for him, and who wants to compress the utmost amount of bracing into a short time. But I am confident that, in spite of its two glaciers, Pontresina is much less bracing than St. Moritz—the difference being due, not to its having a slightly less altitude, but to its lying in a narrower valley, and being less exposed to the winds. Hence, from the point of view of invalids as such, Pontresina gains little, if at all, by the glaciers. But, from the point of view of artists and of all lovers of scenery, it gains immensely. The view of such vast masses of ice, amid summer scenes and summer heat, leaves certainly a most singular impression, and probably affects us all—even those most accustomed to the sight—more, and in more ways, than we suppose. Some imaginative people bethink them that looking at ice on a hot day makes them feel cool; and it is probably true that with certain temperaments, and under certain conditions, the sight of a glacier during the dog-days—even though it be a mere sight and nothing more—may yet (like Moses' view from Mount Pisgah) be a blessing rather than the reverse. Solomon may have had this feeling when he beautifully observes that snow in harvest is as “a faithful messenger to them that send him: for he refresheth the soul of his masters.” But if the mere sight of snow on distant peaks is here meant—and in what other sense could there be snow at harvest-time in Judæa?—the writer must have gazed too intently at the summit of Lebanon, and at last have grown surfeited and impatient. For, in the next chapter, he changes his simile, and pronounces that “as snow in summer, so honour is not seemly for a fool.” In fact, Solomon's feelings were mixed; and of such mixed feelings in presence of this and similar contrasts, most of us have had experience.

A further consideration, quite as potent as either scenery or air in determining an invalid in the choice of an abode, is the quantity and quality of food. When means of communication were scanty, places of great altitude were deficient in this respect. The defect was indeed very obvious, and was pointed out by Milton in a passage

remarkable in itself, and more remarkable from being put into the mouth of Adam when "fatherly displeased" with the "execrable son" who would one day tempt, or force his brethren on to the summit of the tower of Babel:—

"Wretched man! what food
Will he convey up thither, to sustain
Himself, and his rash army; where thin air
Above the clouds will pine his entrails gross,
And furnish him of breath, if not of bread?" (1)

In these physical and economical reflections—reflections, it must be owned, which have the air of proceeding rather from Adam Smith than from Adam the patriarch—two objections are specified which may be urged against all high places from the tower of Babel to St. Moritz—want of food, and want of air. In fact, the charge of giving bad dinners has frequently been brought against the Engadine; and, only a few years ago, when the valley was still a *terra incognita*, and when the natives were as yet unprepared for the bewildering change that was in store for them, the accusation was probably well-founded. But the last few years, one may say, have done the work of centuries; so that now, in all the chief Engadine hotels, the dinners are, not indeed such as to tempt an invalid into over-eating, but generally good enough either for him or for any one else; and what they are generally now, in a few more years they will be universally. In any case, the Engadine is the abode of all others where there is the least excuse for fastidiousness about food; for it unites a physical and a moral condiment, not often found together. In an often-quoted comparison between Plato and mountain air, Joubert says of that air: "Il aiguise les organes et donne le goût des bons aliments;" and some one else has said that a dinner well talked over is half digested. In both these ways, St. Moritz in the summer should make men omnivorous; for it is then a place—its worst enemy would admit—where the appetite proceeding from mountain air runs no possible risk from mountain solitude.² The other count of Adam's indictment against great altitudes is more serious; for the evil, if real, is irremediable. The rarity of the air on mountain-tops was the chief cause of the inveterate prejudice against them. Till quite lately, it was thought incredible that the numerous invalids whose blood requires oxygenation, could gain strength on heights where every cubic foot of air contains less

(1) "Paradise Lost," xii. 74.

(2) People who are now and then dissatisfied with the meat in the Engadine, may be reminded that the milk and cream there are excellent. A few persons, staying on in the autumn, have derived benefit from a modified form of the grape-cure; the kind of grapes medically recommended (*raisins fendants*, as they are called) can be obtained from Meran or elsewhere at small cost.

oxygen than on the plain. Nor indeed does the objection admit of a complete answer. It is quite true that, to meet the various requirements of mountain air, the breath has to be drawn quicker or deeper; also, the pulse beats more frequently; and, in short, the working of the human machine is more rapid. So that a person who seeks health on mountain-tops, may be likened to a trader who puts up with small profits in order to turn over his capital fast. But, whenever such a trader cannot thus recoup himself, he finds the low rate of profit an unmixed evil; and, in like manner, in certain disorders of the respiratory organs and of the heart, the human mechanism cannot increase its speed, and then there is no gain to compensate the loss. A most melancholy case in point occurred in 1872, when a young lady in an advanced stage of consumption was taken to Campfer, and died of sheer suffocation in two days. Likewise, persons whose vigour is impaired by age can seldom quite adapt themselves to these high regions. Even among the Engadiners themselves, it is remarkable how few old people are visible. Except a solitary old woman at Sils Maria, I can hardly remember to have seen any very old person in the valley. The rarity of old *men* should cause little surprise; for many of the men spend the best years of their lives on the plain, and not a few may have suffered from the change of abode, and the sudden and violent change of temperature. But the women mostly stop in the Engadine; and yet women of great age are seldom seen there. I am assured, indeed, that the Engadine contains several aged men and women, who keep indoors. Yet the number of old people who appear must bear a more or less definite proportion to the number of old people who exist; and hence, it is hard to resist the conclusion that the Engadiners, as a rule, are not long-lived. But it by no means follows from this that visitors to the Engadine are committing a slow suicide. I am inclined to think that the normal Englishman should regard dry cold only as an alterative; and that (looking merely to health) he should, when his short change of air and scene is over, take Clough's hint, and—

“Turn to
England, which may, after all be for its children the best.”

That there are very many exceptions to this rule—absolutely very many, though relatively few—and that these exceptional persons are immensely invigorated by a long stay in the Engadine, admits of no question. But what makes them find the air so invigorating, it is hard to say. In truth, St. Moritz is the extreme opposite of the land of the Lotus-eaters; in the former, it “seems” *never* “afternoon,” but almost always early morning. Not, indeed, that the climate is always cold. But there is something about it which imparts a feeling of perpetual motion and excitement. To some

persons—to many on their first arrival—this excitement brings sleeplessness; and to those invalids who require absolute repose and a sort of “afternoon” treatment, it generally proves injurious. But with an opposite class of invalids, the same excitement seems to be the parent of vigour. May not this invigorating restlessness be connected with that quickening of the pulse and winding up of the human clockwork to which we have referred as invariable symptoms on great altitudes? A somewhat similar explanation of the exhilarating influence of mountain air is founded on the comparative absence of atmospheric pressure; it is argued that, on great heights, people have a less weight of air to support, and that they feel like Christian when the burden fell off his back. This solution sounds plausible; nevertheless, there is reason to doubt whether, from the mere diminution of atmospheric pressure—in fact, from the falling of the barometer—any sanitary good can be predicted. The vulgar method of cutting the knot as to the good results of mountain air, is to refer them all to ozone—that unfailing scapegoat of medical ignorance, on whose back climatic effects that cannot be explained are so unceremoniously laid. On heights like the Engadine, there undoubtedly is much ozone; but as to the action of ozone on health, there is still much obscurity. The least ambitious, and probably the wisest, course is provisionally to ascribe the good wrought on invalids by the Engadine air to its cold, dryness, and purity. Other causes of that good—causes which would not operate in an equally cold, dry, and pure air on low ground—may exist; but, if so, they are not fully ascertained.

The popular conceptions are scarcely less hazy about the results of the Engadine climate, than about the climate itself. It is commonly judged of by the specimen presented in July and August; and the snow which sometimes falls, and even lies for a night or two, in that short season, leaves such an impression on witnesses, or at least on reporters, as to cast its white veil over all the fine weather that precedes and follows the snow. Last June, there was a choral festival at Samaden, with singers from all parts of the canton. The 19th was the day fixed for its commencement; but, through the falling of several inches of snow on the 18th—only three days before the longest day of the year—the festival had to be postponed. In 1872 and 1874, the snow lay for a night in August. More than once, I have heard Engadiners say in August that the air was “trop froid pour la neige;” and these words, whatever they exactly meant, have certainly a wintry sound. Perhaps it is natural that snowstorms in the dog-days should beget fears of being snowed up, if not frozen, in autumn. But the fact is, that those whom the Engadine thoroughly suits, would find the Alpine September and October the very months for them. September is almost always the finest month in the year.

It frequently begins with a few wet days; but, in all the five Septembers that I have spent at St. Moritz, the weather was, on the whole, magnificent—cloudless day often following cloudless day, till sometimes, like the faultlessness of Aristides, the uniformity of cloudlessness became wearisome. October is occasionally wet (as in 1878); but more often it is fine. It nearly always has a very fine and warm week—in fact, the Indian summer, or, as the natives call it, the old woman's summer. Several of those who have derived the greatest permanent benefit from St. Moritz, agree that the air only begins to brace them in September; they hold that the actual summer is more stimulating than strengthening; nay, that, in July and August, St. Moritz has only the negative merit of being non-relaxing while other places are relaxing, not the positive merit of being bracing. No absolute rule can be laid down on this subject, both because the temperature varies much in different years, and also because the standard of what braces is relative to the person braced; those whose opinion I quote need much bracing, and fix their standard very high. But, when thus explained, their estimate seems to me not far wrong. At any rate, one happy change comes over the weather in September. The hot Italian winds, so frequent and so trying in the summer, gradually diminish; and the air, as it becomes colder, becomes also stiller. When the winter has fairly set in, there is generally a complete calm; which, indeed, together with the dryness, is what enables many people to bear the winter cold so easily.

Nor is it only on persons seeking to be braced that the Engadine autumn has claims. Many English tourists are, no doubt, restricted as to the time of their holiday; but to a large proportion of them there is, at least, some choice; and to these latter—especially to the painters and botanists among them—I say emphatically that they take their trip to the Engadine at the wrong time. In the late Alpine spring there is a great profusion of wild flowers; but most of these are over (or cut with the hay) before the end of July. Not so very long afterwards begins the autumnal colouring, when the deciduous trees (mainly larches) are seen in that “desolation clothed with loveliness” which belongs quite as much to the Italian autumn as to the autumn of Italian greatness.¹ But the British tourist makes these two beautiful seasons his Scylla and Charybdis, which cannot both be avoided without dexterous steering, but to avoid both of which he somehow contrives. Between these two seasons comes a rather dull interval in August, when there is nothing to relieve the barely distinguishable colouring of the pines and larches, and when, in short, the scenery and sky present a monotony of green and blue. Our countrymen have a way of choosing this dull

[(1) See Shelley's “Ode to Liberty.”]

time for their visit, and can seldom be persuaded that the Engadine has any trees except evergreens, or any autumn worth waiting for. To all these human birds of passage, the snow that often lies for a few hours early in September gives the signal for flight. But, for the "stranger that sojourneth"—for the traveller, that is, who makes a long stay—this passing snow has manifold attractions. First, it is a sign, if not a cause, of that change in the weather from non-relaxing to bracing, of which we have spoken. Secondly, and chiefly, it rids the neighbourhood of the buzzing superfluity both of tourists and of flies. Nor, again, as affecting the scenery, is the September snow otherwise than agreeable; for, when one has in a manner been looking at green for weeks, a glimpse of white is a pleasing variety. It is made all the more pleasing by the thought that there will presently be a yet further change, when the snow begins to melt, and the snow-line appears gradually to climb up the mountain. Thus, the "snow in summer" has associations wholly unlike those of the winter snow; it differs, one may say, from the winter snow, just as the powder wherewith a beauty adorns her hair for a fancy ball, and which is brushed off next morning, differs from the last sad whiteness of age. The winter snow does not fall till the middle of November. It is important to remark that, except occasionally for a few days, the Julier pass is always open. As soon as possible after a heavy fall of snow, the snow-plough does its work; so that communication remains easy throughout the winter. The winters vary greatly in severity. In 1799, the French artillery is said to have crossed the Sils Lake on the ice in the month of May; but such severe cold, so late in the spring, is extremely rare. In the winter of 1871-2, some Cambridge undergraduates came to the Engadine to skate. The skating on the Sils Lake was excellent, and the ice was so clear that through it were seen remains of ancient lake dwellings, said not to be visible in summer through the water.¹ Young Engadiners, being freed in the winter from the incubus of visitors, count it their favourite season, and devote it to sledging parties and dances. So little is the still cold felt, that, once in February, the small party at the Kulm Hotel, after clearing away the snow from a sufficient area, had a picnic on the flat roof—the sun being so hot, that some had to hold up parasols. Encouraged by the

(1) In that winter the skating was unusually good, and lasted long; but, generally, soon after each lake is frozen over, the ice is spoilt by fresh snow. But the lakes begin to bear at different times. I have known a shallow lake (or pond) near Crestalta to bear by the end of October; on the other hand, the St. Moritz lake seldom bears before Christmas. Hence, for skating purposes, the different lakes can be taken in succession. Also, when the Kulm Hotel is kept open in winter, arrangements are made for flooding the croquet ground. But, in fact, this hotel is not kept open unless there are visitors enough to make it pay. After being closed for three successive winters, it was open this last winter, and will probably be open next winter. The Samaden hotel is always kept open; but the visitors are very few.

apparent warmth, one of the ladies tried sketching out of doors; but she was stopped by an untoward event—the paint froze in her brush. It should be further remarked that the food is not less good, while the attendance is much better, in the winter than in the crowded season; and also that the winter cold, though severe in the Engadine, is less so than in Canada.¹ Nor should it be forgotten that, in case an invalid or an invalid's friend should find the cold too intense, an easy descent of six hours over the Maloja pass—a descent all the way, as the pass is lower than St. Moritz—will deposit him in the mild Chiavenna. I am careful to give these details, as extravagant notions are current about the hardships and perils of the Engadine winter, and as cases even occur where persons, having a real object for going to St. Moritz late in the year, are subjected to copious remonstrances, and regarded as bad imitators of the Arctic explorers, imitators who volunteer, without friends or experience, to enter an undiscovered country from whose bourn return is very doubtful.

It appears, then, that, if invalids are to be frozen into health, there is no reason why the candidates for freezing should not go to St. Moritz. But, in fact, at St. Moritz the wintering visitors have been very few. On the other hand, at Davos, where the conditions are nearly the same, their number is great and increasing. It now amounts to about 500, nearly all Germans, and all either invalids or their friends. A large proportion of the invalids are what, in popular language, are vaguely, but conveniently, called consumptive. It is well known that, in the treatment of such cases, medical opinion has undergone a change so astounding as to look like a leap in the dark, or, at best, in the dim twilight. As the remedial agent, the extreme of dry cold has suddenly replaced the extreme of moist heat; and some patients who, only twenty years ago, would have been more or less boiled in Madeira, are now frozen on Alpine heights. How far has this bold experiment succeeded? In the Engadine, certainly, the results (so far as they go) have not been encouraging. Out of the very few who, within my knowledge, have spent winters (or parts of winters) there, at least six have died—a startlingly large portion of the entire number; whereas consumptive cases where the cure of certain disease is itself certain and certainly due to the Engadine winter, are—I will not say unknown—but exceedingly rare.² But,

(1) I stayed at St. Moritz till December 4, 1870. That winter being unusually severe, there were, even before I left, more than 40° Fah. of frost, three nights running. But it is rare for that amount of cold to come before Christmas.

(2) Our threefold repetition of the word "certain" may be thus explained: 1. By the older school of doctors lung disease is sometimes said to exist, where, in truth, it does not. Quite lately a young Englishman was told by a German doctor that his lungs were affected, and was ordered to winter at St. Moritz. Not content with this

on the other hand, there are consumptive patients whom the air seems to have kept alive, and who are, though not well, quite well enough to enjoy life. The list might be swelled with examples of native Engadiners who, having become ill in the plains below, are much better since their return home. It is true that evidence founded on native constitutions is of doubtful application to Englishmen. But, in this inquiry, we must make the most of what evidence we can get; for so few invalids have wintered in the Engadine, that the freezing process should be said, not to have failed there, but never fairly to have been tried. With Davos, of course, the case is different. The experiment has there been tried on such a scale, and for such a time, *vs.*, I think, to leave no reasonable doubt that it has, in many instances, been successful. On the whole, the best medical opinion seems to be that the freezing cure promises well where there is tendency to disease rather than actual disease, or where the disease is either dormant or counteracted by a constitution otherwise sound and vigorous; but that the remedy is always a very strong one, and that, both in Scotland and in Switzerland, it has been used too indiscriminately. Hence the general remark with which this article opened applies with the utmost force to consumptive patients; it is sheer madness for these to seek the mountain-cure without the sanction of a physician *who has made the subject his special study*.

From this doleful topic, it is a relief to pass on to a class of invalids, who, without doubt, profit immensely by the Engadine air. I refer to those (overworked students and others) who, though free from organic defects, suffer from cerebral anæmia, and in general from nervous debility. With these, moreover, the experiment of a prolonged stay is a safe one; for, not being liable to be bedridden, they can depart instantly if they feel less well; and, being organically sound, they can rely on such natural indications as their feelings offer. In the infantine phrase, so long as they like the Engadine air, it probably *likes them*. That many will be thus drawn to St. Moritz, may be inferred from the large and increasing number of nervous sufferers who prefer the English winter, with all its drawbacks, and without its field-sports, to the English summer. This preference is mainly restricted to the younger generation, and seems unaccountable to veterans; who fail to perceive that, on this head, opinion, the patient consulted a physician of Brompton Hospital, who discovered that his lungs were perfectly sound. If he had consulted the English doctor *after* wintering in the Engadine, his soundness would have been ascribed to his so wintering, and his case, though really valueless as evidence, would have been held up as conclusive.

2. Some instances, till lately quoted in favour of the winter-cure, have broken down through death or relapse; perhaps, however, the cure in these cases might have been more effectual if it had had a longer trial. 3. An occasional recovery from lung-disease on Alpine heights proves little; for, even in the bad air of London hospitals, such recoveries occur unexpectedly.

the public taste is being modified scarcely less suddenly than, in Pope's day, it became modified in a very different relation ;—

“ Our fathers praised rank venison, you suppose,
Perhaps, young man, our fathers had no nose.”

We now sometimes credit our forefathers with a no less felicitous inexperience of nerves. Not, of course, that among them functional disorders of the nerves and brain were unknown. But it seems that such disorders are now growing more frequent ; and that they exhibit symptoms novel in their commonness and in their occasional intensity. * One of these symptoms of cerebral anæmia is the very modern craving for cold ; which may be said, like Pallas, to have sprung out of the brain, and to have come full-grown into the world. Such a craving is conspicuous in certain invalids who find the English climate, taken as a whole, too relaxing ; they can hold their ground well enough in the English winter and spring, but they tend to become ill in the summer and autumn. These are the persons already mentioned, who, during July and August, are disappointed with St. Moritz ; they are all the time disposed to complain (slightly altering the famous stanza) that 'tis cold of which their nerves are scant ; 'tis cold not heat for which they pant, more cold and keener than they want. Yet, murmur as they may and do, it is to such as these that the Engadine does most permanent good ; for, of all people, they derive most benefit from prolonging and repeating their visits.

Nearly all the invalids at St. Moritz make trial of the iron-waters ; and such is the reputed efficacy of those waters that St. Moritz ranks next to Schwalbach as the chief centre of the Iron-cure. The mineral spring, being what originally brought the place into notice, is even now, in the opinion of German doctors and patients, its principal attraction ; as, indeed, their preference for the damp Kurhaus over the dry village sufficiently testifies. The best English doctors, on the other hand, regard the air-cure as the one thing needful at St. Moritz. But many English patients, as soon as they get abroad, interpret this medical opinion much as an English judge interprets an old-fashioned statute ; the foreign example chimes in only too well with their own natural inclination to try to hasten their recovery by combining all possible cures in the fullest possible measure ; and haply they comfort themselves by imagining that their medical countrymen have called the grapes sour, and have made light of the great mineral waters merely because so few such can conveniently be taken in England. As we deem this tendency to overrate the iron-waters the most widespread and pernicious delusion respecting St. Moritz—a delusion all the more pernicious, that it provokes in some influential persons a reaction against all use of the waters—we propose to consider the question somewhat fully.

St. Moritz owes much of its success to the fact that, in so many cases, it is the same class of patients that are benefited by its air-cure and by its iron-cure. But this advantage is not wholly unalloyed. A belief is sometimes naïvely expressed, and oftener implied, that the two remedies, being here so conveniently together, have a mysterious and providential connection. For, in sooth, is it not clear that they are adapted, nay intended, to be helpmeets to each other, and that it is not good for either remedy to be alone? Nor is this induction based on the single instance of St. Moritz. Just as Malthusians used to be told that, wherever God creates mouths, he also creates hands—so it is sometimes hinted that, wherever Providence places mineral waters, the air is made to suit their medicinal action. This statement, however, so far as it is correct, can be readily explained. Wherever mineral springs exist and are successful, they prove, not by their existence, but by their success, that the surrounding conditions are not opposed to their medicinal use. Iron-springs exist by scores in damp and unsuitable places; but the virtue of such springs is a *celata virtus*; their waters flow indeed, but flow undrunk, and waste their iron on the desert earth. Also, there are many intermediate cases, cases where mineral springs are situated well enough to be used, but not well enough to become celebrated. Now, as St. Moritz has the great merit that its two cures work together for the benefit of many patients, so it has the misfortune that they are thought to work together more completely than they do. The fact is, that a long spell of mountain air profits many who should use the waters (whether as drinkers or as bathers) for a shorter period, and many who should do without them altogether. Of course it is acknowledged in theory that the air-cure and the iron-cure thus admit of being unequally yoked together; no one goes quite so far as to contend that the two remedies which, at St. Moritz, Nature has joined together, man should never put asunder. Still, many invalids, if directed to leave off taking the waters, are strongly biassed in favour of resuming them as quickly as possible, and in the meantime feel as if they were only taking the cure by halves. Indeed, it is a significant fact that the phrase “taking the cure” is nearly always used with special reference to the waters; and that the time which it is the fashion to allot to this very secondary remedy—usually about three weeks, which would seem to be a common dose for diseases at large—often determines the time allotted to that all-important remedy, the air. The evil hence arising may be best shown by an example. Let us put the case of an invalid who ought to take the iron-cure for three weeks, and the air-cure for three months. He will be strongly disinclined to take the one cure without the other; and he will thus be tempted either to take the iron-cure much too long, or to take

the air-cure not nearly long enough. Probably, indeed, he will make a vicious compromise; and, uniting the two remedies for (say) six weeks, he will obtain the full benefit, not of both, but of neither.

In order to set forth more clearly our estimate of the mineral waters, we must call attention to the two opposite opinions current respecting them. One of these opinions (held generally by old ladies, clergymen, and the least skilful foreign doctors) has already been sketched in outline. It is, in effect, that the iron waters of St. Moritz are so prepared in the divine laboratory, as, to pass in the best possible way through the human stomach; and that the ingredients of the St. Moritz air are accurately measured out for this progress of the waters, like the powder in a gun for the progress of the bullet. Of course this reasoning is extended to mineral waters in general. It is hinted that, just as the town is inferior to the country, because "God made the country and man made the town," so mineral waters, being the Almighty's medicines, must be more efficacious than mere doctor's medicines; and indeed, that they possess certain magical properties, at once too sacred and too subtle for rational investigation; in short, that such divinity doth hedge a spring, that reason can but peep to what it would.¹ It is fair to add that the early Christians, according to Celsus, regarded hot springs as the tears of the damned; so that the new orthodox view of mysterious springs, if lineally descended from the old orthodox view, has at least improved upon it: for it is less lachrymose, though hardly less unscientific.

Indeed, the extreme opposite of the foregoing view is held by some leading men of science; and a comparison between the two views is instructive as denoting the practical difference between what theologians call design, and what philosophers call function. According to the scientific view, the existence of iron-waters at St. Moritz raises not the smallest presumption that they are so fashioned as to second the remedial action of the St. Moritz air. In fact, the world is not thus patriarchally governed; Providence no more tempers the wind to the shorn lamb than the winter's frost to the

(1) Perhaps the very best comment on the wisdom of attaching any special sanctity or beneficence to natural agents is to be found in the choice of David, who, being asked how his subjects should be punished for the census which he had ordered, resolved to let them have pestilence, as *being a natural agent*, and "to fall into the hand of the Lord, for very great are his mercies" (*ἐλπία τεύχε κύνεσσιν Ὀλωποῖσι τε πᾶσι · Διὸς δὲ τελεῖστο βουλὴ*). It is curious that, in a case practically similar, a wish, the exact opposite of David's, is put by Virgil into the mouth of the Greek who was flying from the Cyclops: *Si pereō, hominum manibus periisse juvabit*. We have here a good illustration of the contrast between the eastern tendency towards faith in Nature, and the western tendency towards distrust of her. There is a story that a little girl, asking her mother why the cholera was permitted, was told that it was the Almighty's pleasure. Not long after, hearing that the number of deaths had increased, the child remarked quite innocently, "The Almighty seems to have taken his pleasure last week."

dying fly. The composition of the St. Moritz waters must depend on the form and structure of the adjacent rocks, and indirectly on various physical agencies that worked long ago. Is it pretended that the force and direction of these agencies were predetermined by the requirements of nineteenth-century invalids? Yet, in consistency, the optimistic theologian would be bound to hold, not merely this, but also that from generation to generation the waters have changed their properties with every change in the prevalent diseases; nay, that in each case they are transmuted in the glass or stomach, so as to meet the exact wants of the individual patient. And it need hardly be said that to imagine anything approaching to this, would involve a view of final causes, more sentimental indeed, and more attractive, but not a whit more rational, than the view propounded by the Steward (in *King Lear*) when purposing to murder the blinded Gloucester:—

“That eyeless head of thine was first framed flesh
To raise my fortunes.”

But (an objector may ask) do not mineral waters, like other natural compounds, contain something which, if they are decomposed, cannot be reproduced by art? Granted. It is likely enough that nature, with the time and all the various appliances at her disposal, can make compounds differing from those which art can make. But is all the advantage on nature's side? At any rate, if her chance compounds are fitter for medical purposes than compounds prepared by medical skill, her superiority does not speak much for the doctors. It is true that natural sea-water is better adapted than artificial sea-water to the health and vigour of sea-fish; whence it is sometimes inferred that natural iron-water must be better adapted than artificial preparations of iron to the health and vigour of men. The analogy, however, would be more to the point if our forefathers and we had always thriven upon, and had become adapted to, iron-waters. In fact, it cannot be too clearly laid down that the world was not “made for man” any more than for fish; but that human, as well as piscine, life has had to fit itself into the world. So that all that can safely be said on the subject is, that, wherever men live and thrive, there the manifold conditions of human vigour are present. But what right have we to include iron-water among those conditions; or to assume *a priori* that such water, being natural, is better suited to human sustenance than (for instance) natural sea-water is? It is only by direct experiment that mineral waters can establish any such medicinal claim; and the results of direct experiment are not always in their favour. In the St. Moritz waters, for example, Nature inserts at least one ingredient (lime) in a quantity, if not in a form, which would be deemed faulty in an ordinary prescription. Now, if she does this sort of thing in the green tree, what will she do in the dry?

If she is found to be a bad doctor in simple matters, which can be easily tested, why should we trust her in those subtler matters (such as her mode of combination) which are imperfectly understood, and to which no accurate tests can be applied? Reasoning in some such way as this, many men of science regard the mineral water mania as, in its origin, theological and optimistic, if not as a survival of nature-worship; and some of them (including the late Sir C. Wheatstone) have gone the length of condemning the drinking of such waters as a mischievous waste of time. We have, indeed, given their view, as well as that of their opponents, in our own words; and, for the sake of clearness and brevity, we have omitted some qualifications which the advocates of the respective systems would probably have introduced.

Between these two extreme views lies the view of some English physicians; and to their opinion the present writer subscribes. It may fairly be said that, in regard to mineral water, the theory of the philosophers is sound, but that in practice the *numero plures, virtute et honore minores* are not entirely mistaken. To the philosophers we may at once concede that mineral water is in no sense a water of life, created for the healing of the people. Nor can much objection be made to their estimate of mineral water, regarded from a purely physical point of view. In this respect, the comparison between nature's random medicines and the skilfully devised medicines of doctors, must turn on three things—the ingredients combined, the proportion in which they are combined, and the mode of combination. So far indeed as this last point is concerned, (assuming that her compounds possess properties which cannot be counterfeited by art) I personally should not deny the existence of a slight presumption that, for medical purposes, her mode of combination may be the best. But, on the score of the ingredients, which she bring together at hap-hazard, and of the proportion in which she combines them, the presumption is certainly against her. That these ingredients and this proportion should happen to be the best even for an individual, is, on the face of it, improbable. That they should happen to be the very best for all the multitudes who frequent the most fashionable mineral springs, is utterly impossible—is, in fact, refuted by the immense variety that distinguishes medical prescriptions, and by the minuteness with which these have to be adjusted to each particular case. Now, in order to make our conclusion clear, we will revert to our comparison with sea-fish. In all probability, sea-fish, removed from their native sea, would fare better if transported into a sea whose salt water differed very slightly from their native salt water, than if placed in artificial salt water made as like their native salt water as possible; in short, they would suffer more from the unfitness of man's mode of

combination than from the slight unfitness in the ingredients which Nature combines. Much in the same way, her mineral waters, when their constituents are very nearly the best possible for an invalid, are likely to do him more good than artificial medicines whose constituents (according to present lights) are absolutely the best for him. It is, however, hard to suppose that, according to the laws of chance, her undesigned prescriptions can, in any appreciable number of cases, be thus nearly the best possible.

It appears then, that, physically regarded, the best mineral waters can only in rare instances compete with the best medicine. But, on the side of the mineral waters, there is a great moral advantage; they are taken, not grudgingly or of necessity, but under divers favourable conditions. At St. Moritz especially, the iron-water, as well as the food, has the moral condiment of which we have spoken: it is abundantly "talked over." Thanks to this aid to digestion, though nature's medicine may not in itself be the very best, yet (in the phrase of Prince Hal) we could have better spared a better one; better a second-rate preparation of iron where sociability is, than a first-rate preparation and silence or sullenness therewith. Also, the iron-water is to be taken only in doses of a glass or half a glass at a time; and, after each of these dribblets of iron, a short walk is to follow. It is important to note that even minute rules of this sort are punctiliously followed; so that a turbid mass of invalids is seen passing to and fro before the Kurhaus with the methodical restlessness of hyænas in a cage. To be sure, this peripatetic regimen does not at first sight look inviting; the little walk recommended to patients with a view to the proper action of the waters, makes one think of the little walk which Socrates was told to take with a view to the proper action of the hemlock. But, in fact, the sanitary promenade—uniting as it does the *spectatum* and the *spectentur ut ipsi* attractions of a morning party—seems to cheer people up; at any rate, the iron-cure thus induces many nervous sufferers to take vastly more air and exercise than they would ever dream of taking without it. This, then, is the grand merit of the St. Moritz waters—they are an excuse for a pleasant walking-class; and thus the mystery about them literally *solvitur ambulando*.

While, however, we own to having no great belief in natural waters as such, we must guard ourselves against one or two common misconceptions. People think they have refuted arguments like the above, by affirming that the iron-water at St. Moritz has indubitably strengthened them. Now (even assuming that this is not a case of reasoning *propter quid post*) their assertion presents no difficulty. For it is a form of the *vis medicatrix naturæ*, it is not the *vis medicatrix ferri*, that we are questioning. The iron-water in these cases has done good; but might not an artificial preparation of iron have done

just as much good? Again, some of the Nature-worshippers triumphantly proclaim that they have been able to digest the iron-waters at St. Moritz, though unable to digest iron medicine at home. Very likely; but may not this superiority on the side of St. Moritz be due less to the extreme digestibility of the St. Moritz waters than to the extreme *digestiveness* of the St. Moritz air? Might not these patients have found it harder to take St. Moritz waters at home than iron medicine at St. Moritz? Indeed, this last experiment has been tried. By one English doctor, patients requiring large doses of iron are sometimes advised to keep a strong form (tincture of perchloride) of iron at the well, and to mix with their glass of iron-water a few drops of the strong form of iron; which few drops contain more iron than whole pints of the water contain. This mixture has the slight physical advantage that the alkali of the waters tends to counteract the acid of the mixture. It has the great moral advantage that, when the strong form of iron touches the weak form, virtue is thought to go out of the weak form, and to spread its magical leaven through the entire compound. Even hypochondriacal sufferers can thus be induced to take the strong form of iron with faith, nothing wavering; and, by walking and talking, to give it the same moral condiment that is usually reserved for the weak form. I am careful to mention this practice, because it has hitherto been seldom adopted, and is not generally known; and also, because I am assured that the ailments of visitors at St. Moritz are very commonly due to the fact that, in order to obtain a sufficiency of iron, they are tempted to take too large a quantity of the cold iron-water—a quantity sometimes amounting to six, or even eight, glasses a day.¹ Before we finally quit the mineral waters and the delusions connected therewith, we must briefly advert to a further mischievous result of those delusions. We have already remarked that the short period commonly assigned to the iron-cure tends, in some cases, to limit the period assigned to the air-cure. But not only does the iron-cure (including the baths) seldom, even in summer, admit of being long continued; it is, in any case, almost immediately cut short by the cold of autumn. Early in September the draughts of cold water become less and less in request, and by the middle of the month the baths

(1) I must not be understood to say that "too much of water" is the portion of all who take large and frequent draughts at the iron-spring. On the contrary, I am informed that one of the most useful services rendered by the iron-waters is, that they give a thorough internal washing to the class of habitual diners-out, who have eaten, and perhaps drunk, too much; but whose favourite beverage has certainly not been water. Probably, indeed, plain water would have done these *bon vivants* quite as much good, or more. But, in all likelihood, they would have objected to performing their internal ablutions in commonplace water, like Naaman to bathing in a commonplace river. One thing, at least, is certain. Patients to whom the iron-waters are recommended, for the sake not so much of the iron as of the water, should be regarded more or less as a class by themselves.

are closed. Now, this is exactly the time when almost everybody departs. The fact plainly is, that people then begin to find that something at St. Moritz does not suit them; and they seldom pause to inquire whether the fault lies both with the air-cure and with the iron-cure, or with the iron-cure only. Indeed, one reason why I have so earnestly combated the semi-theological craze about the iron-cure, is because, but for this *ferri sacra fames*, more nervous sufferers might be induced to try the important experiment of spending a few Septembers and Octobers in the Engadine.

It will perhaps be contended that hardly any Englishmen will ever be so akin to polar bears, as to wish or need, out of even a few years of their lives, to spend a third or a fourth part in the Engadine; and that those who, with the desire, have also the leisure, for such a summerless long vacation, will be still fewer. Yet, in regard to the mere finding of leisure, we have ample evidence that where there is a will there is a way, and that whatsoever a man hath he will give for his health. The crowds that manage to winter abroad in the Riviera and other warm places, are among the many proofs of this. An experienced doctor once told me that he had lately discovered with some surprise, how large is the number of delicate people who, having a sufficient competence to secure absolute leisure, devote that leisure to waiting, so to say, upon health. It is true that these patients (in every sense of the word) are quite as often attracted by heat as by cold. But the physician I speak of had been at St. Moritz; and it was mainly to cold-seekers that his language referred. Indeed, we have many illustrations of the truth, that bracing is becoming more and more the order of the day; and that cold (unlike gold) rises steadily in value. On this head, Davos, with its five hundred winterers, speaks volumes. Another indication, less weighty in itself, but more directly bearing on our present subject, is the fascination exercised over many visitors of the Engadine by the wonderfully keen air on the Bernina pass, which is some 1,500 feet higher than St. Moritz. In 1870, a delicate lady found it worth her while to go almost daily from Pontresina to the top of this pass, a distance of twelve miles, so as to breathe the fine air for a few hours. The Hospice on the pass has been since much improved; and some health-seekers, undaunted by the loneliness and the smell of stables, find that a few weeks spent there, make a pleasant change from the noise and occasional heat of St. Moritz—*ego vel Prochyta[m] prepono Suburra*. Of course this preference is restricted to the physical Irreconcilables, who allow of no compromise with heat. But of this small (though increasing) body, a few have found their stay at Bernina the turning-point after a long illness; and how enthusiastically do they now dwell on its abnormal combination of charms! In fact, they go to Bernina to

have the summer of their discontent made glorious winter; transformed, indeed, into a sort of expurgated edition of the English winter—the English winter without its damp, and the east winds without their pungency; differing also from the English winter in the deep blue of the sky, and in the dazzling and enchanting brilliance of the sunlight. One drawback, however, there is to a long residence on this pass: there are absolutely no trees; unless haply we count as a tree, the dwarf willow (*Salix herbacea*), which rises barely two inches from the ground! So that those only should dream of making a stay, whose zeal for turning August into March is such as to reconcile them to the prayer—

“Pono me, pigris ubi nulla campis
Arbor æstivâ recreatur aurâ.”

Perhaps, after all, the absence of trees is not an unmixed evil. The superiority of Bernina to Pontresina in point of bracingness is out of all proportion to the difference between the two places in respect of cold. That superiority is, in great part, due to the extreme dryness of the Bernina air; and the dryness must be increased by the scantiness of vegetation. It should, however, be explained that Bernina is by no means—

“A mountain-top
Where biting cold will never let grass grow.”¹

Many wild flowers grow there, including some not found at the lower elevation of St. Moritz. Also, the wildness of the scenery is heightened by the Cambrena glacier; and by sundry patches of snow close to the Hospice, which linger on into August. But the most striking features in the landscape are the Black and the White lakes, which are only a few yards apart, and the latter of which owes its colour to glacier water. Possibly even the treelessness, and the rocks fantastically scattered about, help to give the scene a certain weird and unearthly attractiveness, and to make it look as if transported bodily from an Eastern tale or from an allegory. The two lakes especially, so close to each other, yet so marvellous in their contrast, recall the passage where Bunyan describes the mouth of the bottomless pit as hard by the gate of the Celestial City. Fact, however, in this case, improves upon fiction, as the White lake at Bernina is much larger than the Black one.

From the White and Black lakes respectively issue streams flowing into the Adda and the Inn. But the finest watershed in the Engadine is at the Lugni See² (not far from Maloja); where, from a single spot, a stone may be cast into the Inn, into a feeder of the

(1) *Henry VI.*, Part II.

(2) Called also “The Frozen Lake.” After the severe winter of 1870–1, it remained frozen until August.

Rhine, or into a feeder of the Po. Some enthusiastic mountaineers call this *the* watershed of Europe; and, in one sense, it deserves the appellation. At St. Gothard, indeed, the watershed is, on the whole, grander; for it contains the sources of the Rhine, the Rhone, the Reuss, and the Ticino. But there is, I believe, no single spot at St. Gothard within a stone's throw of these various sources; so that the Lugni watershed, though otherwise less impressive, has the advantage (one may say) in compactness.

Of the glaciers no minute account will here be attempted; for unfortunately such an account would have to be given at second-hand. The Morteratsch glacier is said to be the easiest to see thoroughly, and also to be the best worth seeing. Carriages can go almost to its base; and non-climbers can form a very fair impression of it from this point and (better still) from the road up to Bernina. The Rosegg glacier is less readily approached through its long valley; and the Roseggthal itself is, in parts at least, not very striking. The mountains do not seem high enough, and the valley is neither narrow enough nor still enough, to come up to one's ideal of Alpine seclusion; and the few struggling trees, suggesting as they do the impotence of Nature, are more destructive either than a luxuriant growth or than complete barrenness, of all sentiment akin to that of the Psalmist who exclaimed, "What is man that thou regardest him?"; or, we may add, to that of the romancist who represented Monte Cristo as fascinated by solitude, "Dans le silence de l'immensité, et sous le regard du Seigneur."

No part of the Engadine impresses me nearly so much as the beautiful valley called Beversthal. In it the number of creeping firs is said to be almost unexampled, that of *pinus cembra* is certainly very great. These with their dark foliage heighten the effect produced by this narrow valley, which is enclosed between high walls of steep and rugged mountains. It runs in a crescent round the back of Pitz Ot; and altogether its aspect has a peculiar charm, a charm which a German writer declares to be unparalleled. Nor is it less to the ear than to the eye that this dim, religious valley is impressive. Baedeker notices the pervading silence of the Engadine as *une particularité étonnante*. This remark may have been correct once; now, however, it can hardly be applied to the main valley of the Engadine—certainly not to St. Moritz and Samaden in the season. But it still holds in reference to the side valleys, especially to Beversthal, which is a sort of mountain *cul de sac* wholly without traffic, and which the absolute stillness helps to make solemn and even deathlike. Perchance this eloquent silence may be one reason why certain spots in the Engadine, when revisited from year to year, so frequently and so painfully recall such sentiments as are entertained for an ancestral home which has been

known from childhood, which stirs every feeling of pride and affection, while yet it reposes in majestic dulness, and has the vault where those who have been loved lie buried. Such gloomy reflections gain force when one observes with what wonderful rapidity, in the cold, dry air of the Engadine, the natives, especially the women, wither and shrivel up. One comes to associate the place with human decay, and to think of it as a sort of gorgeous tomb. Not, of course, that such meditations as these are exclusively a growth of the Engadine. They belong more or less to all mountainous regions; insomuch that they make us feel that there is, after all, a real foundation for Buckle's too sweeping assertion about mountain-scenery overawing men, and disposing them to superstition. Assuredly such scenery enervates us with the reminder that the hills stand fast for ever; while we

ὀππύτε πρῶτα θάνωμε, ἀνάκοι ἐν χθονὶ κοίλῃ
εὐδύμε εὖ μάλα μακρὸν ἀτερμονα νύγρετον ὕπνον.

It is obvious to remark that a similar train of reflections may be excited by the ocean. The ocean (as Byron has shown in a famous passage) has the same sort of effect in dwarfing our dignity and humbling our pride that mountains have. But mountains have this influence in a greater degree. For the sea, with its bustling and tumbling, and its changes between calm and storm, has some analogy, and falls into a kind of sympathy, with human emotions. But, in an Alpine range, the steadfast peaks look down, from age to age, on human weakness and wretchedness with something of the brutal indifference of Epicurean gods. Moreover, a narrow and unfrequented valley, such as Beverthal, tends to stunt and paralyse us more than the sea does, because the mountains rob us of our horizon, and appear to cut us off from the world.¹ It may be added that the sea, with its steamboats and breakwaters, has at least a few signs to mark "how grows the day of human power;" whereas desolate heights merely penetrate and oppress us—as sunrise and sunset oppressed Catullus—with the thought that the individual withers and natural forces are ever the same.

The foregoing sentiment tends, as we have said, to arise in all mountainous districts; or, at any rate, in all those districts, rare in civilised countries, where the natural features are so strongly marked, and where man has added so little, that an ancient inhabitant, if he could now rise from the dead, would recognise his home certainly

(1) The sentiment of isolation springs up in Alpine gorges very commonly. But it affects people in different ways. It has been said of secluded valleys that "elles ont ceci de charmant, qu'on peut croire que c'est la fin du monde, que par delà il en existe un autre bien différent de celui que nous voyons, un monde où règne une divine harmonie, où toutes les femmes sont fidèles, où toute question obtient sa réponse et tout dévouement sa récompense, où les biens sont assurés, où les bonheurs sont éternels."

and at once. But, in the lonely parts of the Engadine, the sentiment is exceptionally strong. A traveller, spending several weeks at the Riffel, has time to get his feelings into harmony with the solitude, and to become, as it were, part of the scene. But, in the neighbourhood of St. Moritz, such gleams of solitude as there are shine brighter through the contrast. After "communing with the universe" on the Fex glacier, the tourist returns at nightfall to the Kulm Hotel, where not unfrequently a ball (with various civilised appendages, such as invitation cards for outsiders) is given by the Italians and English, where once in the season there is a cotillon duly besprinkled with princes and princesses, and lasting till two in the morning, and where last year a newly-arrived lady asked quite seriously the scarcely surprising and possibly prophetic question: "N'est-ce pas qu'il y a un théâtre ici?" To some persons who make a long annual stay in the Engadine, and who object to being bored, a contrast of this sort has its pleasant side; they are not sorry that their summer home should have a time for every work under the sun, including even "a time to dance." But to the genuine lover of mountains, these dancing tourists are so many trespassers on his preserve; he looks upon St. Moritz as a sort of Ramsgate on the Alps, and hates it with perfect hatred. The fact is, that, through the Engadine being a favourite resort of over-worked students, a large proportion of the visitors consists of cultivated persons; and, as the autumn advances, the cockney element almost wholly disappears. But it is with the Engadine itself, as well as with its visitors, that the climbers are at war. Mr. Freshfield goes so far as to describe the Engadine rather enigmatically as bleak uplands "where a shallow uniform trench does duty for the valley which has never yet been dug out, and where the minor and most conspicuous peaks have a mean and ruinous aspect." So harsh a criticism is, we confess, to us incomprehensible; though, no doubt, when we gaze on the huge and hideous Kurhaus, and on the long and most incongruous street of bran new *pensions*, which already crosses the river, and will soon stretch for nearly a mile (from the Kurhaus to the village), we often think how different the stream and lakes would look *viridi si gramine cluderet undas herba*, and if giant hotels (to say nothing of the projected railroad) did not violate the native rock.¹ But, at any rate, the hotels and *pensions* cannot "violate" the summits of the hills around; so that, at the worst, the immediate neighbourhood of St. Moritz will become—what both Ireland and Cheshire have been called—an ugly picture in a beautiful frame.

Another fault sometimes found with the Engadine is that the valley might be in any mountainous country; it lacks some of the characteristic features of Swiss scenery. There are many places out

(1) See Juvenal, III. 19, 20.

of Switzerland to which it is compared. It is said closely to resemble Nynneetal in India; and it has been likened to various places in Norway, in Scotland, and in Wales. To me individually, the drive from St. Moritz to Sils and to the Maloja—with the chain of lakes on the left hand, which sometimes wear the aspect of a wide river—most forcibly recalls the ten miles, said to be the most beautiful in North Wales, between Dolgelly and Barmouth. Those who have never seen the Engadine, will deem the comparison of Wales with it extravagant; but, in truth, though Pitz Languard is more than triple the height of Cader Idris, yet, when it is seen from the high Engadine valley, and through the clear Engadine air which makes mountains seem nearer but smaller, and also when the eye has been trained to judge by the Swiss standard of magnitude, the Swiss mountain does not appear much larger than the Welsh. Hence it arises that by mountaineers who have become *blasés* for all mountain views short of the grandest, as well as by some busy men whose holidays are short, and who need a total change, the scenery of the Engadine is thought tame and unattractive. But, for persons obliged to spend a large proportion of their lives in it, the valley derives an additional charm from its comparative homeliness and its manifold associations; it calls up old times, and gives a picture—though a magnified and idealized picture—of familiar scenes. Possibly there is a certain attraction even in that “hardness” of the Engadine scenery which is the bugbear of artists, who seem to say of mountain views—as Principal Tulloch says of religious opinions—that they should be somewhat *hazy*. Still, this clearness or hardness helps one, as it were, to keep hold of the entire scene; the outline of the mountains, if too sharp for painters, yet by reason of its sharpness sticks in the memory.

At all events, for the Engadiners themselves, the charm of the valley is irresistible. Their intense love of home may serve to explain a peculiarity which has often been noticed. When one considers their land and climate, one fancies that nature has done her very best to keep the inhabitants in penury. Yet, on entering their houses, one almost always observes signs of easy circumstances, sometimes even of affluence. In fact, it may almost be said that, of Alpine valleys, the Engadine is at once the poorest and the richest. No doubt, this general well-being is partly a result, because a condition, of a successful struggle with nature; those only can live and bring up families in the cold climate who can afford the comfort which the cold climate requires. Something, also, is probably due to the stringent rule which existed till within the last few years, restraining from marriage persons who had not means for the support of a family. But a similar regulation is said to have prevailed in other parts of Switzerland, and therefore does not account

for the pre-eminent prosperity of the Engadine. That prosperity is commonly ascribed to the fortunes which the Engadiners throughout Europe have made as pastrycooks. The strange thing, however, is, that these fortunes, having been made out of the Engadine, should ever find their way into it. Of the wealth acquired by Irishmen in America, only a small part is brought to Ireland; and even patriotic coolies enrich their native land, not with their money, but with their bones. But the emigrant Engadiners are still of the Engadine, and unto the Engadine they return; and the only reason they give for their so returning is that, from their beloved mountains, they cannot permanently keep away. They come back to the heights from which they went forth—bound, so to say, by a mechanical law, like that which raises water to its own level. Natives of the Engadine and of the adjacent valleys use touching language on this subject. Not long ago, at Tiefenkasten, attention was drawn to two sisters by reason of the marked difference between them in point of education. It was found that both had been to school at Munich, but that there the elder of them became ill and melancholy. The doctor pronounced the illness to be *Heimweh*—a recognised and not uncommon malady of the Swiss. The poor girl grew worse and worse, and drooped as if disappointed in love; till, at last, she was told to go home, and to save her life at the expense of her education. It is probable that her case was an extreme one. But of all the Engadiners, even of those who succeed best abroad, it may be said that, like the fallen angels, they count themselves strangers in the low country, and that their one hope is in after years

“To reascend

Self-raised, and repossess their native seat.”

Hence, by comparison, it may be judged how strong a fascination this delightful valley exercises over the delicate people whom it exactly suits, particularly over those who can enjoy tolerable health by spending season after season in it, and who can enjoy such health in no other way. Some of these—such, especially, as have not had too much of a good thing by being obliged to spend entire winters in the Engadine—look upon it as their favourite home, and can say in regard to it: *Ubi bene, ibi patria*.

LIONEL A. TOLLEMACHE.

M. TAINE'S NEW WORK.¹

THE announcement that one of the most ingenious and accomplished men of letters in Europe was engaged upon a history of the French Revolution raised some doubts among those who have thought most about the qualifications proper to the historian. M. Taine has the quality of the best type of a man of letters; he has the fine critical aptitude for seizing the secret of an author's or an artist's manner, for penetrating to dominant and central ideas, for marking the abstract and general under accidental forms in which they are concealed, for connecting the achievements of literature and art with facts of society and impulses of human character and life. He is the master of a style, which if it seems to lack the breadth, the firmness, the sustained and level strength of great writing, is yet always energetic, and fresh, and alive with that spontaneous reality and independence of interest which distinguishes the genuine writer from the mere weaver of sentences and servile mechanic of the pen. The matter and form alike of M. Taine's best work—and we say best, for his work is by no means without degrees and inequalities of worth—prove that he has not shrunk from the toil and austerity of the student, from that scorn of delight and living of laborious days, by which only can men either get command of the art of just and finished expression, or gather much knowledge.

But with all its attractiveness and high uses of its own, the genius for literature in its proper sense is distinct from the genius for political history. The discipline is different, because the matter is different. To criticise Rousseau's Social Contract requires one set of attainments, and to judge the proceedings of the Constituent Assembly or the Convention requires a set of quite different attainments. A man may have the keenest sense of the filiation of ideas, of their scope and purport, and yet have a very dull or uninterested eye for the play of material forces, the wayward tides of great gatherings of men, the rude and awkward methods that sometimes go to the attainment of wise political ends.

It would perhaps not be too bold to lay down this proposition: that no good social history has ever been written by a man who has not either himself taken a more or less active part in public affairs, or else been an habitual intimate of persons who were taking such a part on a considerable scale. Everybody knows what Gibbon said about the advantage to the historian of the Roman Empire of having been a

(1) *Les Origines de la France Contemporaine*. Tom. i. *L'Ancien Régime*. Par H. Taine. Paris: Hachette. 1876.

member of the English parliament and a captain in the Hampshire grenadiers. Thucydides commanded an Athenian squadron, and Tacitus filled the offices of prætor and consul. Guicciardini was an ambassador, a ruler, and the counsellor of rulers, and Machiavel was all these things and more. •Voltaire was the keen-eyed friend of the greatest princes and statesmen of his time, and was more than once engaged in diplomatic transactions. Robertson was a powerful party chief in the Assembly of the Scotch Church. Grote and Macaulay were active members of parliament, and Hallam and Milman were confidential members of circles where affairs of state were the staple of daily discussion among the men who were responsible for conducting them to successful issues. Guizot was a prime minister, Finlay was a farmer of the Greek revenue. The most learned of contemporary English historians a few years ago contested a county, and is habitually inspired in his researches into the past by his interest in the politics of the present. The German historians, whose gifts in reconstructing the past are so valuable and so singular, have for the most part been as actively interested in the public movements of to-day as in those of any century before or since the Christian era. Niebuhr held more than one political post of dignity and importance; and of historical writers in our time, one has sat in several Prussian parliaments; another, once the tutor of a Prussian prince, has lived in the atmosphere of high politics; while all the best of them have taken their share in the preparation of the political spirit and ideas that have restored Germany to all the fulness and exaltation of national life. It is hardly necessary to extend the list. It is indeed plain on the least reflection that close contact with political business, however modest in its pretensions, is the best possible element in the training of any one who aspires to understand and reproduce political history. Political preparation is as necessary as literary preparation. There is no necessity that the business should be on any majestic and imperial scale. To be a guardian of the poor in an East-End parish, to be behind the scenes of some great strike of labour, to be an active member of the parliamentary committee of a Trades Council or of the executive committee of a Union or a League, may be quite as instructive discipline as participation in mightier scenes. Those who write concrete history, without ever having taken part in practical politics, are, one might say, in the position of those ancients who wrote about the human body without ever having effectively explored it by dissection. Mr. Carlyle, it is true, by force of penetrating imaginative genius, has reproduced in stirring and resplendent dithyrambs the fire and passion, the rags and tears, the many-tinted dawn and the blood-red sunset of the French Revolution; and the more a man learns about the details of the Revolution, the greater is his admiration for Mr. Carlyle's magnificent performance. But it is dramatic

presentation, not social analysis ; a masterpiece of literature, not a scientific investigation ; a prodigy of poetic insight, not a sane and quantitative exploration of the complex processes, the deep-lying economical, fiscal, and political conditions, that prepared so immense an explosion.

We have to remember, it is true, that M. Taine is not professing to write a history in the ordinary sense. His book lies, if we may use two very pompous but indispensable words, partly in the region of historiography, but much more in the region of sociology. The study of the French Revolution cannot yet be a history of the past, for the French still walk *per ignes suppositos*, and the Revolution is still some way from being fully accomplished. It was the disputes between the Roman and the Reformed churches which inspired historical research in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and it is the disputes among French parties that now inspire what professes to be historiography, but what is really a sort of experimental investigation in the science of society. They little know how long and weary a journey lies before them, said Burke, who undertake to bring great masses of men into the political unity of a nation. The process is still going on, and a man of M. Taine's lively intellectual sensibility can no more escape its influences, than he can escape the ingredients of the air he breathes. We may add that if his work had been really historic, he must inevitably have gone further back than the eighteenth century for the 'Origins' of contemporary France. The very slight, vague, and unsubstantial chapter with which he opens his work, cannot be accepted as a substitute for what the subject really demanded—a serious summary, however condensed and rapid, of the various forces, accidents, deliberate lines of policy, which from the breaking up of the great fiefs down to the death of Lewis the Fourteenth, had prepared the distractions of the monarchy under Lewis's descendants.

Full of interest as it is, M. Taine's book can hardly be described as containing much that is new or strikingly significant. He develops one idea, indeed, which we have never before seen stated in its present form, but which if it implies more than has been often advanced by previous writers in other forms, cannot be accepted as true. This is perhaps a point better worth discussing than any other which his book raises. The rest is a very elaborate and thorough description of the structure of society, of its physiognomy in manners and characteristics, the privileges, the burdens, the daily walk and conversation of the various classes which made up the French people between the Regency and the Revolution. M. Taine's method of description does not strike one as altogether happy. It is a common complaint against French historians that they are too lax about their authorities, and too heedless about giving us chapter and verse for

their assertions. M. Taine goes to the contrary extreme, and pours his note-books into his text, with a steady-handed profusion that is excessively fatiguing, and makes the result far less effective than it would have been if all this industrious reading had been thoroughly fused and recast into a homogeneous whole. It is an ungenerous trick of criticism to disparage good work by comparing it with better; but the reader can scarcely help contrasting M. Taine's overcrowded pages with the perfect assimilation, the pithy fulness, the pregnant meditation of De Tocqueville's book on the same subject. When we attempt to reduce M. Taine's chapters to a body of propositions standing out in definite relief from one another, yet conveying a certain unity of interpretation, we soon feel how possible it is for an author to have literary clearness along with historic obscurity.

In another respect we are inclined to question the felicity of M. Taine's method. It does not convey the impression of movement. The steps and changes in the conflict among the organs of the old society are not marked in their order and succession. The reader is not kept alive to the gradual progress of the break-up of old institutions and ideas. The sense of an active and ceaseless struggle, extending in various stages across the century, is effaced by an exclusive attention to the social details of a given phase. We need the story. You cannot effectively reproduce the true sense and significance of such an epoch as the eighteenth century in France, without telling us, however barely, the tale, for example, of the long battle of the ecclesiastical factions, and the yet more important series of battles between the judiciary and the crown. If M. Taine's book were a piece of abstract social analysis, the above remark would not be true. But it is a study of the concrete facts of French life and society, and to make such a study effective, the element of the chronicle, as in Lacretelle or Jobez, cannot rightly be dispensed with.

Let us proceed to the chief thesis of the book. The new formula in which M. Taine describes the source of all the mischiefs of the revolutionary doctrine is this. "When we see a man," he says, "who is rather weak in constitution, but apparently sound and of peaceful habits, drink eagerly of a new liquor, then suddenly fall to the ground, foaming at the mouth, delirious and convulsed, we have no hesitation in supposing that in the pleasant draught there was some dangerous ingredient; but we need a delicate analysis in order to decompose and isolate the poison. There is one in the philosophy of the eighteenth century, as curious as it was potent: for not only is it the product of a long historic elaboration, the final and condensed extract in which the whole thought of the century ends; but more than that, its two principal elements are peculiar in this,

that when separated they are each of them salutary, yet in combination they produce a poisonous compound." These two ingredients are first, the great and important acquisitions of the eighteenth century in the domain of physical science; second, the fixed classic form of the French intelligence. "It is the classic spirit which, being applied to the scientific acquisitions of the time, produced the philosophy of the century and the doctrines of the Revolution." This classic spirit has in its literary form one or two well known marks. It leads, for instance, to the fastidious exclusion of particulars, whether in phrases, objects, or traits of character, and substitutes for them the general, the vague, the typic. Systematic arrangement orders the whole structure and composition from the period to the paragraph, from the paragraph to the structural series of paragraphs; it dictates the style as it has fixed the syntax. Its great note is the absolute. Again, "two principal operations make up the work of the human intelligence: placed in face of things, it receives the impression of them more or less exactly, completely, and profoundly; next, leaving the things, it decomposes its impression, and classifies, distributes, and expresses more or less skilfully the ideas that it draws from that impression. In the second of these processes the classic is superior." Classicism is only the organ of a certain reason, the *raison raisonnante*; that which insists upon thinking with as little preparation and as much ease as possible; which is contented with what it has acquired, and takes no thought about augmenting or renewing it; which either cannot or will not embrace the plenitude and the complexity of things as they are.

As an analysis of the classic spirit in French literature, nothing can be more ingenious and happy than these pages (p. 241, etc.). But, after all, classic is only the literary form preferred by a certain turn of intelligence; and we shall do well to call that turn of intelligence by a general name that shall comprehend not only its literary form but its operations in every other field. And accordingly at the end of this very chapter we find M. Taine driven straightway to change classic for mathematic in describing the method of the new learning. And the latter description is much better, for it goes beneath the surface of literary expression, important as that is, down to the methods of reasoning. It leads us to the root of the matter, to the deductive habits of the French thinkers. The mischief of the later speculation of the eighteenth century in France was that men argued about the complex, conditional, and relative propositions of society, as if they had been theorems and problems of Euclid. And M. Taine himself is, as we say, compelled to change his term when he comes to the actual facts and personages of the revolutionary epoch. It was the geometric, rather than the classic, quality of

political reasoning, which introduced so much that we now know to have been untrue and mischievous.

Even in literary history it is surely nearer the truth to say of the latter half of the century that the revolutionary movement began with the break-up of classic form and the gradual dissolution of the classic spirit. Indeed this is such a commonplace of criticism, that we can only treat M. Taine's inversion of it as a not very happy paradox. It was in literature that this genius of innovation which afterwards extended over the whole social structure, showed itself first of all. Rousseau, not merely in the judgment of a foreigner like myself, but in that of the very highest of all native authorities, Sainte Beuve, effected the greatest revolution that the French tongue had undergone since Pascal. And this revolution was more remarkable for nothing than for its repudiation of nearly all the notes of classicism that are enumerated by M. Taine. Diderot again in every page of his work, whether he is discussing painting, manners, science, the drama, poetry, or philosophy, abounds and overabounds in those details, particularities, and special marks of the individual, which are, as M. Taine rightly says, alien to the classic genius. Both Rousseau and Diderot, considered as men of letters, were conscious literary revolutionists before they were used as half-conscious social revolutionists. They deliberately put away from them the entire classic tradition as to the dignity of personage proper to art, and the symmetry and fixed method proper to artistic style. This was why Voltaire, who was a son of the seventeenth century before he was the patriarchal sire of the eighteenth, could never thoroughly understand the author of the *New Heloïsa* or the author of the *Père de Famille* and Jacques le Fataliste. Such work was to him for the most part a detestable compound of vulgarity androdomontade. "There is nothing living in the eighteenth century," M. Taine says, "but the little sketches that are stitched in by the way and as if they were contraband, by Voltaire, and five or six portraits like Turcaret, Gil Blas, Marianne, Manon Lescaut, Rameau's Nephew, Figaro, two or three hasty sketches of Crebillon the younger and Collé" (p. 258). Nothing living but this! But this is much and very much. We do not pretend to compare the authors of these admirable delineations with Molière and La Bruyère in profundity of insight or in grasp and ethical mastery, but they are certainly altogether in a new vein even from those two great writers, when we speak of the familiar, the real, and the particular, as distinguished from old classic generality. And, we may add in passing, that the social life of France from the death of Lewis XIV. downwards was emancipated all round from the formality and precision of the classic time. As M. Taine himself shows in many amusing pages, life was singularly gay, free, sociable, and varied. The literature of the time was sure to reflect, and does

reflect, this universal rejection of the restraints of the age when the classic spirit had been supreme.

Apart from this kind of objection to its exact expression, let us look at the substance of M. Taine's dictum. "It was the classic spirit, which, when applied to the scientific acquisitions of the time, produced the philosophy of the century and the doctrines of the Revolution." Even if we substitute geometric or deductive spirit for classic spirit, the proposition remains nearly as unsatisfactory. What were the doctrines of the revolution? The sovereignty of the people, rights of man, liberty, equality, fraternity, progress and perfectibility of the species—these were the main articles of the new creed. M. Taine, like too many French writers, writes as if these ideas had never been heard of before '89. Yet the most important and decisive of them were at least as old as the Reformation, were not peculiarly French in any sense, and were no more the special products of the classic spirit mixing with scientific acquisitions, than they were the products of Manicheanism. It is extraordinary that a writer who attributes so much importance to Rousseau, and who gives us so ample an account of his political ideas, should not have traced these ideas to their source, nor even told us that they had a source wholly outside of France. Rousseau was a protestant; he was a native of the very capital and mother city of protestantism militant and democratic; and he was penetrated to his heart's core by the political ideas which had arisen in Europe at the Reformation. There is not a single principle in the Social Contract which may not be found either in Hobbes, or in Locke, or in Althusen, any more than there is a single proposition of his deism which was not in the air of Geneva when he wrote his *Savoyard Vicar*. If this be the case, what becomes of the position that the revolutionary philosophy was worked out by the *raison raisonnée* which is the special faculty of a country saturated with the classic spirit? If we must have a formula, it would be nearer the truth to say that the doctrines of the Revolution were the product, not of the classic spirit applied to scientific acquisitions, but first of the democratic ideas of the protestant reformation, and then of the fictions of the lawyers, both of them allied with certain urgent social and political necessities.

So much, then, for the political side of the 'philosophy of the century,' if we are to use this too comprehensive expression for all the products of a very complex and manysided outburst of speculative energy. Apart from its political side, we find M. Taine's formula no less unsatisfactory for its other phases. He seems to us not to go back nearly far enough in his search for the intellectual origins, any more than for the political origins, of his contemporary France. He has taken no account of the progress of the spirit of Scepticism from Montaigne's time, nor of the decisive influence of

Montaigne on the revolutionary thinkers. Yet the extraordinary excitement aroused in France by Bayle's Dictionary was a proof of the extent to which the sceptical spirit had spread before the Encyclopædists were born. The great influence of Fontenelle was wholly in the same sceptical direction. There was a strong sceptical element in French Materialism, even when materialism was fully developed and seemed most dogmatic.¹ Indeed it may sometimes occur to the student of such a man as Diderot, to wonder how far materialism in France was only seized upon as a means of making scepticism both serious and philosophic. For its turn for scepticism is at least as much a distinction of the French intelligence as its turn for classicism. And, once more, if we must have a formula, it would be best to say that the philosophy of the century was the product first of scepticism applied to old beliefs which were no longer easily tenable, and then of scepticism extended to old institutions that were no longer practically habitable.

And this brings us to the cardinal reason for demurring to M. Taine's neatly rounded proposition. His appreciation of the speculative precursors of the Revolution seems to us to miss the decisive truth about them. He falls precisely into those errors of the *raison raisonnée* about which in his description of the intellectual preparation of the great overthrow, he has said so many just and acute things. Nothing can be more really admirable than M. Taine's criticism upon Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, as great masters of language (pp. 339-361). All this is marked by an amplitude of handling, a variety of approach, a subtlety of perception, a fulness of comprehension, which give a very different notion of M. Taine's critical soundness and power from any that one could have got from his account elsewhere of our English writers. Some of the remarks are open to criticism, as might be expected. It is hard to accept the saying (p. 278) that Montesquieu's "celebrity was not an influence." It was Montesquieu, after all, who first introduced among the Encyclopædic band a rationalistic and experiential conception of the various legal and other conditions of the social union, as distinguished from the old theological explanation of them. The correspondence of Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, D'Alembert, is sufficient to show how immediately, as well as how powerfully, they were influenced by Montesquieu's memorable book. Again, it is surely going too far to say that Montesquieu's Persian Letters contained every important idea of the century. Does it, for instance, contain that thrice fruitful idea which Turgot developed in 1750, of all the ages being linked together by an ordered succession of causes and effects? These and other objections, however, hardly affect the brilliance and substantial excellence of all this part of the

(1) See Lange's *Gesch. d. Materialismus*, i. 298.

book. It is when he proceeds to estimate these great men, not as writers but as social forces, not as stylists but as apostles, that M. Taine discloses the characteristic weaknesses of the book-man in dealing with the facts of concrete sociology. He shows none of this weakness in what he says of the remote past. On the contrary he blames, as we have all blamed, Voltaire, Rousseau, and the rest of the group, for their failure to recognise that the founders of religions satisfied a profound need in those who accepted them, and that this acceptance was the spontaneous admission of its relative fitness. It would be impossible to state this important truth better than M. Taine has done in the following passage :—

“At certain critical moments in history,” he says, “men have come out from the narrow and confined track of their daily life, and seized in one wide vision the infinite universe; the august face of eternal nature is suddenly unveiled before them; in the sublimity of their emotion they seem to perceive the very principle of its being; and at least they did discern some of its features. By an admirable stroke of circumstance, these features were precisely the only ones that their age, their race, a group of races, a fraction of humanity, happened to be in a condition to understand. Their point of view was the only one under which the multitudes beneath could place themselves. For millions of men, for hundreds of generations, the only access to divine things was along their path. They pronounced the unique word, heroic or tender, enthusiastic or tranquillising; the only word that around them and after them, the heart and the intelligence would consent to hearken to; the only one adapted to the deep-growing wants, the long-gathered aspirations, the hereditary faculties, a whole moral and mental structure,—here to that of the Hindu or the Mongol, there to that of the Semite or the European, in our Europe to that of the German, the Latin, or the Slav; in such a way that its contradictions, instead of condemning it, were exactly what justified it, since its diversity produced its adaptation, and its adaptation produced its benefits.” (p. 272.)

It is extraordinary that a thinker who could so clearly discern the secret of the great spiritual movements of human history, should fail to perceive that the same law governs and explains all the minor movements in which wide communities have been suddenly agitated by the word of a teacher. It is well—as no one would be more likely to contend than myself, who have attempted the task—to demonstrate the contradictions, the superficiality, the inadequateness, of the teaching of Rousseau, Voltaire, or Diderot; but it is well also, and in a historical student it is not only well, but the very pith and marrow of criticism, to search for that ‘adaptation,’ to use M. Taine’s very proper expression, which gave to the word of these teachers its mighty power and far-spreading acceptance. Is

it not as true of Rousseau and Voltaire, acting in a small society, as it is of Buddha or Mahomet acting on vast groups of races, that "leur point de vue était le seul auquel les multitudes échelonnées au dessous d'eux pouvaient se mettre"? Did not they too seize, "by a happy stroke of circumstance," exactly those traits in the social union, in the resources of human nature, in its deep-seated aspirations, which their generation was in a condition to comprehend,—liberty, equality, fraternity, progress, justice, tolerance?

M. Taine shows, as so many others have shown before him, that the Social Contract, when held up in the light of true political science, is very poor stuff. Undoubtedly it is so. And Quintilian—an accomplished and ingenious Taine of the first century—would have thought the Gospels, and Epistles, and Augustine and Jerome and Chrysostom, very poor stuff, compared with the—

"Mellifluous streams that watered all the schools
Of Academics old and new, with those
Summed Peripatetics, and the Sect
Epicurean, and the Stoic severe."

And in some ways, from a literary or logical point of view, the early Christian writers could ill bear this comparison. But great bodies of men, in ages of trouble and confusion, have an instinctive feeling for the fragment of truth which they happen to need at the hour. They have a spontaneous apprehension of the formula which is at once the expression of their miseries and the mirror of their hope. The guiding force in the great changes of the world has not been the formal logic of the schools or of literature, but the practical logic of social convenience. Men take as much of a teacher's doctrine as meets their real wants. the rest they leave. The Jacobins accepted Rousseau's ideas about the sovereignty of the people, but they seasonably forgot his glorification of the state of nature and his denunciations of civilisation and progress. The American revolutionists cheerfully borrowed the doctrine that all men are born free and equal, but they kept their slaves.

It was for no lack of competition that the ideas of the Social Contract, of Raynal's History of the two Indies, of the System of Nature, of the Philosophical Dictionary, made such astounding and triumphant way in men's minds. There was Montesquieu with a sort of historic method. There was Turgot, and the school of the economists. There were seventy thousand of the secular clergy, and sixty thousand of the regular clergy, ever proclaiming by life or exhortation ideas of peace, submission, and a kingdom not of this world. Why did men turn their backs on these and all else, and betake themselves to revolutionary ideas? How came these ideas to rise up and fill the whole air? The answer is that, with all their contradiction, shallowness, and danger, these ideas fitted the crisis.

They were seized by virtue of an instinct of national self-preservation. The evil elements in them worked themselves out in infinite mischief. The true elements in them saved France, by firing men with social hope and patriotic faith.

How was it, M. Taine rightly asks, that the philosophy of the eighteenth century which was born in England and thence sent its shoots to France, dried up in the one country, and grew to overshadow the earth in the other? Because, he answers, the new seed fell upon ground that was suited to it, the home of the classic spirit, the country of *raison raisonnée*. Compare with this merely literary solution, the answer given to the same question by De Tocqueville:—"It was no accident that the philosophers of the 18th century generally conceived notions so opposed to those which still served as the base of the society of their time; *these ideas had actually been suggested to them by the very sight of that society, which they had ever before their eyes.*" (*Ancien Régime*, 206.) This is the exact truth and the whole truth. The greatest enterprise achieved by the men of letters in the period of intellectual preparation was the Encyclopædia; and not many months ago I tried to present in these pages what seemed to be ample evidence that the spirit and aim of that great undertaking were social, and that its conductors, while delivering their testimony in favour of the experiential conception of life in all its aspects, and while reproducing triumphantly the most recent acquisitions of science, had still the keenest and most direct eye for the abuses and injustice, the waste and disorder, of the social institutions around them. The answer, then, which we should venture to give to M. Taine's question would be much simpler than his. The philosophy of the eighteenth century fared differently in England and in France, because its ideas did not fit in with the economic and political conditions of the one, while on the contrary they were actively warmed and fostered by those of the other. It was not a literary aptitude in the nation for *raison raisonnée* which developed the political theories of Rousseau, the moral and psychological theories of Diderot, the anti-ecclesiastical theories of Voltaire and Holbach. It was the profound disorganization of institutions that suggested and stimulated the speculative agitation. "The nation," wrote the wise and far-seeing Turgot, "has no constitution; it is a society composed of different orders ill assorted, and of a people whose members have few social bonds with one another; where consequently scarcely any one is occupied with anything beyond his private interest exclusively," and so forth. (*Œuv.* ii. 504.) Any student, uncommitted to a theory, who examines in close detail the wise aims and just and conservative methods of Turgot, and the circumstances of his utter rout after a short experiment of twenty months of power, will rise from that deplorable episode with the conviction that a

pacific renovation of France, an orderly readjustment of her institutions, was hopelessly impossible. '*Si on avait été sage !*' those cry who consider the revolution as a futile mutiny. If people had only been prudent, all would have been accomplished that has been accomplished since, and without the sanguinary memories, the constant interpolations of despotism, the waste of generous lives and noble purpose. And this is true. But then prudence itself was impossible. The court and the courtiers were smitten through the working of long tradition by judicial blindness. If Lewis XVI. had been a Frederick, or Marie Antoinette had been a Catherine of Russia, or the nobles had even been stout-hearted gentlemen like our cavaliers, the great transformation might then have been gradually effected without disorder. But they were none of these, and it was their characters that made the fate and doom of the situation. As for the court, Vergennes used an expression which suggests the very key-word of the situation. He had been ambassador in Turkey, and was fond of declaring that he had learnt in the seraglio how to brave the storms of Versailles. Versailles was like Stamboul or Teheran, oriental in etiquette, oriental in destruction of wealth and capital, oriental in antipathy to a reforming grand vizier. It was the Queen, as we now know by incontestable evidence, who persuaded the king to dismiss Turgot, merely to satisfy some contemptible personal resentments of herself and her creatures.¹ And it was not in Turgot's case only that this ineptitude wrought mischief. In June, 1789, Necker was overruled in the wisest elements of his policy, and sent into exile, by the violent intervention of the same court faction, headed by the same Queen, who had procured the dismissal of Turgot thirteen years earlier. And it was one long tale throughout, from the first hour of the reign down to those last hours at the Tuileries in August, 1792; one long tale of intrigue, perversity, and wilful incorrigible infatuation.

Nor was the Queen only to blame. Turgot, says an impartial eyewitness—Creutz the Swedish ambassador—is a mark for the most formidable league possible, composed of all the great people in the kingdom, all the parliaments, all the finance, all the women of the court, and all the pious. It was morally impossible that the reforms of any Turgot could have been acquiesced in by that emasculated caste, who showed their quality a few years after his dismissal by flying across the frontier at the first breath of personal danger. "When the gentlemen rejoiced so boisterously over the fall of Turgot, their applause was blind; on that day they threw away, and in a manner that was irreparable, the opportunity that was offered them of being born again to political life, and changing the state-candlestick of the royal household for the influence of a pre-

(1) *Corresp. entre Marie Thérèse et le Comte Mercy-Argentau*, vol. iii.

ponderant class. The nobility, defeated on the field of feudal privilege, would have risen again by the influence of an assembly where they would have taken the foremost place; by defending the interests of all, by becoming in their turn the ally of the third estate, which had hitherto fought on the side of the kings, they would have repaired the unbroken succession of defeats that had been inflicted on them since Lewis the Fat."¹ It would be easy to name half a dozen patricians like the Duke d'Ayen, of exceptional public spirit and capacity, but a proud order cannot at the first exigency of a crisis change its traditional front, and abandon the maxims of centuries in a day. As has been said more than once, the oriental policy of the crown towards the nobles had the inevitable effect of cutting them off from all opportunity of acquiring in experience those habits of political wisdom which have saved the territorial aristocracy of our own country. The English nobles in the eighteenth century had become, what they mostly are now, men of business; agriculturists at least as much as politicians; land-agents of a very dignified kind, with very large incomes. Sully designed to raise a working agricultural aristocracy, and Colbert to raise a working commercial aristocracy. But the statesman cannot create or mould a social order at will. Perhaps one reason why the English aristocracy became a truly agricultural body in the eighteenth century, was the circumstance that many of the great landowning magnates were Tories and remained sulking on their estates rather than go to the court of the first two kings of the Hanoverian line; just as the dependence of these two sovereigns of revolutionary title upon the revolution families is one reason why English liberties had time to root themselves thoroughly before the monarchical reaction under George III. In France, for reasons which we have no space to expatiate upon, the experiments both of Sully and of Colbert failed. The result may be read with graphic effect in the pages of Arthur Young, both before the revolution broke out, and again after Burke's superb rhetoric had biassed English opinion against it.

M. Léonce de Lavergne, it is true, in his most interesting book upon the Provincial Assemblies under Lewis XVI., has endeavoured to show that in the great work of administrative reform all classes between 1778 and 1787 had shown themselves full of a liberal and practical spirit. But even in his pages we see enough of apprehensions and dissensions to perceive how deep was the intestine disorganization; and the attitude of the nobles in 1789 demonstrated how incurable it was by any merely constitutional modifications. Sir Philip Francis, to whom Burke submitted the proof sheets of the *Reflections*, at once with his usual rapid penetration discerned the weakness of the anti-revolutionary position. "The French of this day," he told

(1) *Bathie*, 380.

Burke, "could not act as we did in 1688. They had no constitution as we had to recur to. They had no foundation to build upon. They had no walls to repair. Much less had they '*the elements of a constitution very nearly as good as could be wished.*' A proposition so extraordinary as this last ought to have been made out *in limine*, since the most important deductions are drawn from it."¹ But, though Burke insisted on drawing his deductions from it with sweeping impetuosity, neither he nor any one else has yet succeeded in establishing that all-important proposition.

What we desire to say, then, comes, in short, to this, that M. Taine has given an exaggerated importance to the literary and speculative activity of the last half century of the old monarchy. In measuring the force of the various antecedents of the Revolution, he has assigned to books and philosophical ideas a place in the scale of dissolvent conditions that belongs more rightly to decayed institutions, to incompetent and incorrigible castes, to economic incongruities that could only be dealt with trenchantly. Books and ideas acquired a certain importance, after other things had finally broken up the crumbling system. They supplied a formula for the accomplished fact. "It was after the Revolution had fairly begun," as a contemporary says, "that they sought in Mably and Rousseau for arms to sustain the system towards which the effervescence of some hardy spirits was dragging affairs. It was not the above-named authors who set people's heads aflame. M. Necker alone produced this effect and determined the explosion."²

The predominance of a historic, instead of an abstract school, of political thought could have saved nothing. It could have saved nothing, because the historic or conservative organs and elements of society were incompetent to realise those progressive ideas which were quite as essential to social continuity as the historic ideas. The historic method in political action is only practicable on condition that some at any rate of the great established bodies have the sap of life in their members. In France not even the judiciary, usually the last to part from its ancient roots, was sound and quick. "The administration of justice," says Arthur Young, "was partial, venal, infamous. The conduct of the parliament was profligate and atrocious. The bigotry, ignorance, false principles, and tyranny of these bodies were generally conspicuous."³ We know what the court was, we know what the noblesse was, and this is what the third great leading order in the realm was. We repeat then that the historic doctrine could get no fulcrum nor leverage, and that only the revolutionary doctrine which the eighteenth century had got ready for the crisis, was adequate to the task of social renovation.

(1) Burke's Corresp. iii. 167.

(2) Sénac de Meilhan, *Du Gouvernement en France*, 129, etc. (1795).

(3) *Travels in France*, i. 603.

Again, we venture to put to M. Taine the following question. If the convulsions of 1789—94 were due to the revolutionary doctrine, if that doctrine was the poison of the movement, how would he explain the firm, manly, steadfast, unhysterical quality of the American revolution thirteen years before, which was theoretically based on exactly the same doctrine? Jefferson and Franklin were as well disciplined in the French philosophy of the eighteenth century as Mirabeau or Robespierre. The Declaration of Independence recites the same abstract and unhistoric propositions as the Declaration of the Rights of Man. Why are we to describe the draught which Rousseau and the others had brewed as a harmless or wholesome prescription for the Americans, and as maddening poison to the French? The answer must be that the quality of the drug is relative to the condition of the patient, and that the vital question for the student of the old régime and the circumstances of its fall, is what other drug, what better process, could have extricated France on more tranquil terms from her desperate case. The American colonists, in spite of the over wide formula of their Declaration, really never broke with their past in any of its fundamental elements. They had a historic basis of laws and institutions which was still sound and whole, and the political severance from England made no breach in social continuity. If a different result followed in France, it was not because France was the land of the classic spirit, but because her institutions were inadequate, and her ruling classes incompetent to transform them.

M. Taine's figure of the man who drains the poisonous draught, as having been previously 'a little weak in constitution, but still sound and of peaceful habits,' is surely delusive. The whole evidence shows that France was not sound, but the very reverse of sound, and no inconsiderable portion of that evidence is to be found in the facts which M. Taine has so industriously collected in his own book. The description of France as a little weak in constitution, but still sound and of peaceful habits, is the more surprising to us because M. Taine himself had in an earlier page (p. 109), when summing up the results of Privilege, ended with these emphatic words:—"Déjà avant l'éroulement final, la France est dissoute, et elle est dissoute parce que les privilégiés ont oublié leur caractère d'hommes publics." But then is not this rather more than being a little weak in constitution, but still sound?

EDITOR.

THE CATHOLIC PERIL IN AMERICA.

How the renewed aggressiveness of the Papal Imperialism is to affect the future of the United States, is a question of vital concern to their citizens; and it is of this country that I am to speak. Hitherto the clergy of the Catholic Church have forbore to raise the question of jurisdiction in any open manner here; they are wisely biding their time, being content for the present with the fact of rapid and enormous growth in numbers, wealth, and power. This masterly inactivity has deceived, and still deceives, great multitudes of educated Americans, who feel the natural aversion which culture always tends to create against "agitation" of all sorts, and who flatter themselves, like the cheerful antediluvians said to have been warned by Noah of the coming Deluge, that "there is not going to be much of a shower." They rely too much on the general influences of civilisation and political freedom as antidotes for Catholic fanaticism; they credulously or indolently accept the smooth professions of American Catholic orators like Father Hecker, who are very glib in the use of popular catchwords, but who are easily understood by any one competent to rate at its actual value the "freedom," "education," and so forth, offered by the Roman Church.

It is my duty to give such statistical information respecting the Catholic Church in the United States as I have been able to collect. It is no easy matter to obtain full and trustworthy religious statistics of any kind; there are too many motives for exaggeration or understatement in sectarian reports, and the United States census reports are exceedingly meagre. Nevertheless, the following facts, taken from the census reports of 1850, 1860, and 1870, are as trustworthy as they are important.

First may be considered the growth in wealth of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, as compared with that of the whole country, and of the leading Protestant denominations.

In 1850, the total property valuation of the United States, according to the census report of that year, was \$7,135,780,228; in 1860, it was \$16,159,616,068; in 1870, it was \$30,068,518,507. That is to say, the aggregate wealth of the country increased about 125 per cent. from 1850 to 1860, and about 86 per cent. from 1860 to 1870.

The total property valuation of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, in 1850, was \$9,256,758; in 1860, it was \$26,774,119; in 1870, it was \$60,985,565. That is to say, the aggregate wealth of the Catholic Church increased about 189 per cent. from 1850 to 1860, and about 128 per cent. from 1860 to 1870.

While, therefore, in the first of these two decades, the wealth of the whole country gained 125 per cent., the wealth of the Catholic Church gained 189 per cent.; and while, in the second decade, the wealth of the whole country gained 86 per cent., the wealth of the Catholic Church gained 128 per cent. • Whatever causes may have contributed to this significant result, it is certain that among the chief of them must be reckoned exemption from just taxation, extraordinary shrewdness of financial management, and fraudulent collusion with dishonest politicians.

Further, the relative growth of Protestantism and Catholicism in point of wealth, must by no means be overlooked. In 1850, when the Catholics had \$9,256,758 of church property, the Baptists had \$11,020,855; the Episcopalians, \$11,375,010; the Methodists, \$14,822,870; the Presbyterians, \$14,543,789. In 1870, when the Catholics had \$60,985,566, the Baptists had \$39,229,221; the Episcopalians, \$36,514,549; the Methodists, \$69,854,121; the Presbyterians, \$47,828,732. Thus the Catholics had in 1870 already distanced all their Protestant competitors, with the single exception of the Methodists, and they will soon distance the latter too (if they have not already done so), provided the past is a satisfactory index of the future. For, while in the twenty years from 1850 to 1870 the Methodists, whose astonishing growth is the standing boast of the Evangelical Protestants of this country, made a gain of 371 per cent. in the value of their church property, the Catholics made in the same twenty years a corresponding gain of 558 per cent. At this rate the Roman Catholic Church will have outstripped, at no remote day, the Methodists and all the other Protestant sects combined, in the race for wealth.

No satisfactory information, however, is furnished by the census reports respecting the growth either of the Catholic Church or of the Protestant sects in point of numbers, for they give in each case only the "church accommodations" or "sittings," which by no means indicate the number of worshippers. The total number of sittings, Catholic and Protestant together, was only 21,665,062 in 1870, when the total population of the United States was 38,558,371; that is, considering the actual size of church congregations, fully one-half of the whole population, and in all probability much more, seldom or never go to church at all. In most Protestant churches in this country a great many seats are usually unoccupied, and the number of sittings is largely in excess of the numbers of the congregations. In most Catholic churches, however, the reverse is true, the seats being usually all taken and the aisles often filled, while the same seat is usually occupied by several different persons in the three or four different congregations which fill the church on Sunday at successive services. So far, however, as the number of sittings

alone is concerned, significant results may be easily deduced from the following table constructed upon the data of the census:—

No. of Sittings.	1850.	1860.	1870.
Protestant . . .	13,567,002	17,724,314	19,674,548
Catholic . . .	667,823	1,404,437	1,990,514
Total . . .	14,234,825	19,128,751	21,665,062

A little calculation, based on these figures, will show that, during the decade 1850—1860, there was an increase of 30 per cent. for the Protestants and 110 per cent. for the Catholics; and that, in the decade 1860—1870, there was an increase of 11 per cent. for the Protestants and nearly 42 per cent. for the Catholics. Notwithstanding the absolute diminution of these rates of increase in the second decade, the relative superiority of the Catholics remained about the same.

The number of church buildings owned by the Catholics in 1850 was 1,222; in 1860, 2,550; in 1870, 3,806. The total number of their ecclesiastical, charitable, and educational organizations in 1870 was 4,127. This is all the information of importance which I have been able to derive from the census reports.

In the silence of the census as to the absolute number of Roman Catholics in this country, all estimates are to be received with caution. Gibson's *Ecclesiastical Almanac* for 1869 states the increase of Protestants (in the loose sense of that word) to have been from 21,000,000 to 27,000,000 between the years 1859 and 1868, and that of Catholics from 2,500,000 to 5,000,000; in the former case an increase of 29 per cent. in nine years, and in the latter case an increase of 100 per cent. in the same period. At this rate of increase the number of Catholics in the United States at present cannot be far from 9,000,000, and by the end of the century will exceed that of the total non-Catholic population. Certain it is that the Catholics have been boasting for many years that they will elect their own President in the year 1900. The third revised edition of Professor Schem's "Statistics of the World for 1875" estimates the number of our Catholic population as 6,000,000. The *American Annual Cyclopædia* for 1875 estimates it as more than 6,000,000, and states that the Roman Catholic Church in the United States has 1 cardinal, 8 archbishops, 54 bishops, 4,873 priests, 4,731 churches, 1,902 chapels, 68 colleges, and 511 academics.

How the Catholics themselves arrive at an estimate of their own numbers in the United States, and how plausible a ground it gives to their confident anticipation of eventual supremacy, appears from the statements of the *New York Catholic World*, the leading periodical of the Church published in America. The Catholic rule is to allow

an average of 2,000 people (men, women, and children) to each parish priest—a rule which is claimed to be proved correct by experience. Allowing 4,500 to be the number of such priests, the Catholic population would be 9,000,000, and I am inclined to consider this a pretty good guess, in the absence of exact census returns. This is the remarkable account of the progress of the Church. In 1776 the Catholics numbered about 25,000; in 1789 they were 30,000, in a population of about 3,000,000, or one one-hundredth of the whole; in 1808 they were 100,000, in a population of 6,500,000, or one-sixty-fifth of the whole; in 1830 they were 450,000, in a total of 13,000,000, or one-twenty-ninth of the whole; in 1840 they were 960,000, in a total of 17,070,000, or one-eighteenth of the whole; in 1850 they were 2,150,000, in a total of 23,191,000, or one-eleventh of the whole; in 1860 they were 4,400,000, in a total of 31,000,000, or one-seventh of the whole; in 1870 they were 8,500,000, in a total of some 40,000,000, or over a fifth of the whole. For a period of forty years—from 1830 to 1870—Catholics thus more than doubled their number every decade, while the general population increased at the rate of about 35 per cent. The explanation of this wonderful fact is to be found in the vast immigration from Ireland and other Catholic countries—Ireland alone sending to these shores over 2,000,000 of emigrants from 1830 to 1870. These statements give the Catholic view of the subject—my authority being the *Catholic World*, as epitomized by Father Stack in *Harper's Weekly* for July 3, 1875.

Notwithstanding this wonderful growth of the Roman Church in numbers, as compared with that of the general population and the various Protestant sects, the Catholics themselves, while pointing exultingly to the rapid progress of their Church, at the same time deplore a great and constant defection of Catholic-born children from the faith of their parents. In a letter written in 1836 to the Central Council for the Propagation of the Faith at Lyons, Bishop England, of Charleston, South Carolina, communicated the following statements relative to the condition of the Church in the United States:—

“I have long been under the impression that not only in Europe, but even in the United States, very delusive fancies have been entertained of the progress of the Catholic Church in our Union, and even many mistakes as to the means most conducive to its propagation. I have no doubt upon my mind that within fifty years millions have been lost to the Catholic Church in the United States. . . . Nothing can be more plain than that, instead of an increase of the members naturally belonging to the Catholic Church in the United States, there has been actually a serious loss. . . . I do not mean to say that the number of Catholics is in this day less than it was fifty years ago, nor as small as it was five years since; but I do assert that the loss of numbers to the Catholic Church has been exceedingly great, when we take into account the Catholic population at the time of the American Revolution, the acquisition of

territory previously occupied by Catholics, the arrivals of Catholic emigrants, and the conversions to the Catholic religion."

Estimating the number of Catholics in the United States at that time (1836) as 1,200,000, the bishop goes through some calculations, and adds:—

"If I say, upon the foregoing data, that we ought, if there were no loss, to have five millions of Catholics, and that we have less than a million and a quarter, there must be a loss of three millions and three quarters; and the persons so lost are found amongst the various sects to the amount of thrice the number of the Catholic population of the whole country."

In the same strain the *New York Irish World* of July 25, 1874, published a very long and elaborate article to prove that 18,000,000 of Catholics have thus been lost to the Church. It says:—

"What ought to be the Catholic population of the United States to-day? To this we answer that the *natural product* of Catholic immigration to this country, from its first settlement to this day, without counting in one solitary convert, ought to be 28,000,000. The Catholic population is, in fact, but 10,000,000. Ecclesiastical statisticians put the figures all the way from 5,000,000 to 8,000,000. Hardly any of them go above the latter figure. We are convinced, however, there are 10,000,000 who were baptized Catholics. But even at this there are 18,000,000 lost to the Church; that is, there are 18,000,000 more of the population of the United States who, either by immediate birth or by right of descent from first settlers, ought to be professed Catholics, but who now are to be found in the ranks of Protestantism or Nothingarianism."

It is not necessary to accept the figures of the *Irish World* as even approximately accurate; in fact, they are deserving of little consideration, when we find that, out of the total white population of 3,172,461 in the original thirteen colonies at the close of the Revolutionary war, 1,903,200 are claimed as "Celtic (Irish, Scotch, Welsh, French, etc.);" Nevertheless, amazing as has been the growth of the Catholic Church in this country, there cannot be the least doubt that its present membership would be very much larger than it is, had its rate of increase not been constantly diminished by a steady stream of deserters from the rising generations. Bishop England and the *Irish World* make no mistake in emphasizing this fact as of supreme importance to the future destiny of the Church. It is a fact which the *Irish World* labours to account for by "Ireland's subjection to England;" but the prelates, priests, and intelligent laity of the Church perfectly comprehend the true cause of it. They know that the great defection of Catholic children from the Catholic faith is caused by their constant contact with decatholicizing influences in a predominantly non-Catholic community—an "evil" which they are powerless to prevent; they know that these influences necessarily act upon the children with greater or less effect in the free public schools; they know that, unless they can succeed in isolating the children of Catholics from

the children of non-Catholics, and subjecting them to exclusively Catholic influences in their tender and impressible years, the hold of the Church upon their obedience must ~~and~~ does grow very feeble, and is soon lost in a great many cases; they know that the general effect of our public school system, though no effort at proselytism is permitted, is to quicken the intellect of the children so far as to render them indocile under a *régime* of authoritative faith. They have therefore adopted the fixed policy of aiming at the total destruction of our public school system, at least as now conducted. Those who wish to read an elaborate, able, and fanatical condensation of the Catholic view of this question will find it in "Public School Education," a duodecimo volume of over four hundred pages, written by the Rev. Michael Müller, and published by D. and J. Sadlier, of New York. The policy of the American bishops in this matter is simply the practical application and vigorous enforcement of the principles of the Encyclical and Syllabus; and there is no possibility of its being changed till these manifestoes are recalled.

The attack began with complaints of the use of the Protestant Bible, read "without note or comment," in the schools. There is inherent justice in this complaint, and I must concede that, in protesting against taxation for the support of evangelical or semi-evangelical schools, the Catholics command the sympathy of all who believe in secular instruction alone in State schools. But they do not stop there; they really want, not that the Bible should be excluded, but that it should be supplemented by Catholic interpreters and Catholic surroundings; they will be satisfied with nothing short of putting the whole school system under the practical control of the Catholic clergy, or of partitioning out the school funds among the various denominations, or of excusing the Catholic laity from all taxation for school purposes. What they have set their faces against is State education in any shape; Protestant schools are bad enough, but secular or "godless" schools are, in their eyes, still worse. But the whole fabric of our educational, nay, of our national, system rests on the clear right of the State to educate its voters, in sheer self-defence against internal dissolution through illiteracy and its universally concomitant crime and pauperism. Wherever universal suffrage prevails, universal education must also prevail, as the indispensable means of securing that universal intelligence without which no free commonwealth is possible; in fact, the principle of "compulsory," (or, better, *guaranteed*) education, is more and more evidently needed to attain the desired object.

In Cincinnati, during the winter of 1869—1870, the action of the Board of Education in explicitly prohibiting Bible-reading in the schools of that city led to long litigation, and ultimately, in December, 1872, to the sanction of their action by the Supreme

Court of Ohio. In this case (a full and interesting report of which can be obtained from Robert Clarke, and Co., of Cincinnati), the Catholics were more or less implicated. I quote from the argument of George R. Sage, Esq., before the Superior Court :—

“From the year 1829 to the year 1842, the Bible, without note or comment, was read in the schools, no one objecting. There were then no Catholic parochial schools. The Bishop of the Catholic Church—he who is now Archbishop—was for some time a member of the Board of Examiners, and active in support of the schools. In 1842 the first intimation of an objection was made. It was not to the reading of the Bible, but that Catholic children were required to read the ‘Protestant Bible and Testament.’ The Board promptly and unanimously conceded everything suggested by the objection. From that time until the year 1852, no further objection was made. The Bible was read, and the schools prospered. In 1852 the next move was made. Almost simultaneously a similar movement in the interest of the Catholic Church was made throughout the country. It is said that this was in accordance with the action of a secret conclave of the authorities of that Church held in the city of Baltimore. Whether such was the fact is not material. A Catholic member of the Board, in the interest of the Catholic Church, presented a series of resolutions, admitting the necessity of reading the Bible in the schools, and authorising the introduction of the translation approved by the Catholics, and that approved by the Jews, and their use by those preferring them. The Board, upon assurance that its action would be satisfactory, enacted a rule granting all that the resolutions called for. The next year the Catholic parochial schools were established, and the whole power of the Catholic Church was arrayed against the public schools. The Board, in its annual report for that year, announced that they were ‘constrained to infer that no union of action or system is intended or desired by the assailants of the public schools upon any terms but such as are incompatible with the principles and usages which thus far have sustained the free schools of this country.’”

It is not easy, in reading this record of the tortuous policy pursued by the Church, to be satisfied with the degree of good faith which it manifested. Its demands to-day are inconsistent with public schools of any kind which are practically uncontrolled by itself, as is evident from Archbishop Purcell's communication to the Cincinnati Board, on September 18, 1869 :—

“The entire government of public schools in which Catholic youth are educated cannot be given over to the civil power. We, as Catholics, cannot approve of that system of education for youth which is apart from instruction in the Catholic faith and the teaching of the Church. If the School Board can offer anything in conformity with these principles, as has been done in England, France, Canada, Prussia, and other countries, where the rights of conscience in the matter of education have been fully recognised, I am prepared to give it respectful consideration.—JOHN B. PURCELL, *Archbishop of Cincinnati*.”

Not to multiply quotations unnecessarily, I will only add the following remarkably bold and explicit passage from the Lenten Pastoral of Bishop Gilmour, of Cleveland, Ohio, in 1873 :—

“At present [note the implication of this *at present*] we have nothing to hope from the State. Yet we must not therefore cease to insist upon our rights, and, if needs be, at the polls demand them. Were Catholics alive and united on the school question,—were they to demand from every man who asks their

vote a pledge that he would vote for our just share of the school fund,—legislators would learn to respect the Catholic vote, and give us our just rights. . . . But in the meantime what are we to do? Fold our arms and sit idle? Let our children grow up in ignorance, and so be beaten in the race of life? Send them to the public schools, where not only their faith will be endangered, but their virtues exposed? No, a hundred times no! We must build Catholic schools everywhere, and at whatever cost support and lift them up till they are equal to the best. It is our solemn injunction and most positive command that every church in the diocese have its schools. Where a congregation cannot at once build both church and school, let them build the school-house and wait for the church. There is little danger of the old losing their faith, but there is every danger that the young will. On the school question there can be and there must be no division. Either we are Catholics or we are not. If we are Catholics, we must leave after us a Catholic youth. And experience has clearly proved this cannot be done, unless the children are early taught and daily taught that they are Catholics. We must not sleep while our enemies are working. Nor must we forget that the public schools are organized and managed for and in the interests of Protestantism. We solemnly charge and most positively require every Catholic in the diocese to support and send his children to a Catholic school. When good Catholic schools exist, and where it may be honestly said a child will get a fair common-school education, if parents either through contempt for the priest, or disregard for the laws of the Church, or for trifling and insufficient reasons, refuse to send their children to a Catholic school, then in such cases, but in such cases only, we authorise confessors to refuse the sacraments to such parents as thus despise the laws of the Church, and disobey the command of both priest and bishop."

This Lenten Pastoral of Bishop Gilmour, which excited a great commotion in Ohio, and contributed not a little to the remarkable agitation of the school question in the subsequent political campaign of 1875 in that State, was vigorously replied to at the time by the Rev. T. B. Forbush, a Unitarian clergyman of Cleveland, whose lectures and addresses rendered important service in securing the defeat of the Catholic-Democratic coalition of the last season.

No doubt can be left in the mind of any one who even superficially studies this subject, that the entire forces of the Catholic Church (excepting only here and there an isolated and half-liberalised Catholic, like Senator Kernan, of New York, or Mayor Kelby, of Richmond) are gradually becoming massed in determined opposition to the public school system, or that their opposition, which is already arousing an aggressive Evangelical reaction, threatens to destroy even the present imperfect secularism of the schools, and thereby ultimately the public school system itself; for it may be safely said that American voters will certainly refuse to be taxed for the support of other men's religions, and that, if they cannot agree to support public schools independent of all religions, they will sooner or later refuse to be taxed for public schools of any sort. And the worst peril of the Catholic agitation at present is the possibility of its so inflaming the jealousy and bigotry of Protestants as to lead to a general adoption of church-schools, or (worse even than that) the effective and permanent fortification of the present sectarian features

of the public schools by the adoption of measures which, as I shall show below, must involve a tremendous revolution in the whole theory of American politics.

The degree of success already achieved by the Catholic clergy in alienating the affections of their flocks from the public school system, may be seen by the public boast of Bishop McQuaid, of Rochester, New York, who said four years ago: "There are at the present time not far from one hundred thousand Catholic children in the Christian free schools of the State of New York"—i.e., in the parochial schools supported voluntarily by Catholics. Turning over the leaves of *Sadlier's Catholic Directory*, in every diocese there is seen to be a long list of such schools, with a large number of pupils in each; but the labour of adding them all up, which would be herculean, is left to the reader. It is evident that the parochial school system is in a highly flourishing condition, and must be supported by the vast majority of the Catholic laity. Whoever imagines (and multitudes of otherwise intelligent persons in this country indulge the imagination) that the Catholic laity cannot be depended upon to follow the lead of their clergy in opposition to the public school system, should devote a few hours to a careful inspection of this *Directory*. To select the very first list of parochial schools, that of the archdiocese of Baltimore, as an illustration, he would find 61 schools, with a total attendance of 13,916 scholars, and an average attendance of about 240. A similar showing is made in all the other archdioceses, dioceses, and vicariates apostolic. Of course there are not a few individual Catholics who are too lax in the faith to give up the substantial advantages of a public school education for their children, even for the threats or promises of the Church; and for the present the ecclesiastical authorities tolerate a certain amount even of open opposition. But it is the extreme of credulity to be deceived by such facts as these into doubting the fixity of the ecclesiastical purpose or the certainty of general lay compliance. The parochial system is so flourishing, and so well sustained by lay contributions, as already to have seriously reduced the attendance at the public schools in many places, and in a few (as in some parts of Brooklyn, I believe) to have almost broken them up. Bishop McQuaid declared, in 1871, that the city of Rochester, New York, in which he resides, had 4,000 children in the Catholic schools, and 5,500 in the public schools; and he added, in the same spirit as that of Bishop Gilmour's above-quoted Lenten Pastoral: "In the years to come we shall be more occupied with school-building, and with the education of our children, than the erecting of churches, although this work will not be permitted to stand still."

Bishop Ryan, of Buffalo, like every bishop who has spoken publicly on the subject, has declared the same policy, and avowed himself "a

stern, avowed, and uncompromising enemy" of all schools in which positive instruction in the Catholic faith is not given. The result of this unanimous policy has been to tax heavily the pockets of the people, who have nevertheless cheerfully submitted in the main.

But the Catholic warfare against secular State education, is not alone manifested by the establishment of a great independent system of Church schools: it adapts itself to circumstances. Wherever the Church can get control of the public schools, it does not scruple to do so; and, if the Catholics ever become the majority, as they confidently expect, their objections to State education will vanish. The Louisville, Kentucky, *Catholic Advocate*, of August 12, 1875, published the following letter:—

" East St. Louis, Ill., August 4th, 1875.

" *Editor Catholic Advocate.*—Yours of the 28th ult. was received, but, being absent from home, I could not answer you ere this. The scrap of news hailing from East St. Louis is true. The Board of Education permits us to select our own teachers, and they are approved of by the Board according to law. Catechism is taught outside of school hours in the school-rooms. Our text-books are all right. You seem anxious to know how comes it that our schools are supported by the public funds. Well, it is this wise: the majority of our population are Catholics, and they elect Catholic directors. This is the key that solves the grant. You may make any comment you please. I simply give the facts as required.

Yours very respectfully,

" P. J. O'FALLORAN, V.F."

Some of the comments on this letter, made by the editor of the *Catholic Advocate*, are so instructive, and throw so much light on the subject under discussion, that I must not omit them, considering that the original words are more satisfactory than any paraphrase of my own:—

" Catholics may from this plainly see for themselves that the settlement of this fretted question depends altogether on votes. In cities where justice to Catholics is most easy, there are always a sufficient number of Catholic voters to turn the tide of election in any way they please, if they will but unite and intelligently use their franchise, the only argument that can reach the non-Catholic public. It is by no means necessary that Catholics should be in a majority in a community to obtain a division of the school-fund—a small return for what they yearly pay for this purpose into the public treasury. It is only necessary that they should allow politicians to divide among themselves, as their own ambition and pecuniary interest will always divide them, and then cast the weight of the Catholic vote in favour of every good man who is willing to support the Catholic claim for justice. In this way a comparatively small band of voters may elect to office men of their own principles."

The whole world knows how New York city lay for years at the mercy of a gang of thieves and robbers called the Tammany Ring, who stole millions upon millions of the public money, and kept themselves in power by the Catholic vote, which was always ready to support such "good" men as Tweed, Sweeney, Connolly, Hall, Barnard, McCann. In 1869, 1870, and part of 1871, under the

régime of this precious set, sectarian appropriations out of the money raised by tax on the property of New York citizens were made to 103 Catholic institutions, including churches, hospitals, parochial schools, and so forth, to the amount of \$1,396,389. During the same time, appropriations were made to Protestant institutions to the amount of \$112,293, and to Hebrew institutions to the amount of \$25,852: both together, \$138,145. All this money was virtually stolen money. The Protestants accepted 7 per cent., and the Catholics 91 per cent. Over and above this, in 1869, the Catholics got \$178,672, the Protestants \$6,500, and the Hebrews and others \$29,788 of excise money. And the same story must be told of the succeeding years, even after the downfall of the Ring, the amounts only being less, down to the 1st of January, 1875, when the exasperated people put a summary stop to all further sectarian stealings by an amendment to the State Constitution. But the debt of New York city, according to Comptroller Green's statement, amounted, on October 1, 1875, to \$131,113,906.74; and for a very large, if not the major, part of this enormous debt the Catholic vote must be held responsible, since without it the rogues could not have committed their robberies, nor their insatiate party remained in power. In this manner the Catholic Church, accepting largesses of money which it well knew to be stolen property, built up its costly parochial schools for the better training of its children in the elements of morals. If it should be held to be directly implicated in the thefts by which it so largely profited, and to be consequently unfitted for giving instruction in any morals but those of the pickpocket, it might protest against the severity of such a judgment, but would find it extraordinarily difficult to dispute its justice. So far as they shared in this public iniquity, the Protestants and Hebrews also must share in the public disgrace; but the chief offenders have the chief title to the unenviable distinction it confers. There is little cause for surprise if the astonishing growth of the Catholic Church, and its relentless hostility to thoroughly honest education as given in the public schools, have excited grave disquietude in the minds of all American citizens who do not favour a general corruption of public morals.

Perceiving, then, how easy it is in this country for an unprincipled minority to acquire controlling power, and how ready the Catholic Church is to aid and abet their plots for its own sinister purposes, and how mischievously it is already using its great political influence to compass the destruction of our only real safeguard, the public school system, every intelligent and sincere friend of free institutions must deplore the garrulous fatuity which so loudly and frequently urges that because the Catholics are only a minority they are not to-day dangerous. Is it so new a thing for a

minority to govern? Did not a minority of 300,000 slaveholders conquer the whole United States, compelling us, for many decades, to obey their own imperious will? Did not a ridiculously small minority, the Tammany Ring, conquer the City and State of New York, ruling and robbing without check, because they were cunning and organized, while the great public were stupid, indifferent, and disunited? What gigantic and persistent efforts were necessary to break the sceptre of this half-dozen of treasury-pilferers, and how small has been the success of those who tried to punish the robbers and recover the plunder! Minority, indeed! But has not the world been ruled by minorities from time immemorial? The Catholic party is certainly a minority, nevertheless it is to-day winning victory after victory over the great helpless majority, and will continue to do so, fastening itself on the neck of the nation, like the Old Man of the Sea on the neck of Sindbad the Sailor, unless the majority have sense enough to open their eyes and enact the measures necessary for the preservation of their liberties. The elements of its power are chiefly these:—

The Roman Catholic Church is a *universal, political power, foreign nowhere, but everywhere at home*—a Theocratic Imperialism of the most absolute character, both spiritual and temporal—a system of government claiming and exercising the most despotic authority over the action of every one of its subjects, in political just as much as in private concerns. It commands the conscience and the suffrage of every Catholic citizen in support of every measure which it judges advantageous to its own interests, and thus lays an iron hand on the very roots of all political power. It wields this power solely with an eye to its own aggrandizement, and aims at a universal dominion, which is hostile to every fundamental principle of the United States Constitution and of modern civilisation.

In America, where everything is done by voluntary association, and where Protestant organizations are forced to enter into competition with the Catholic Church, the superior efficiency of the latter as an organization is indicated unmistakably in the statistics of their relative growth given above. There is no "canon law," technically considered, which is recognized by the civil courts of the United States; and the priests enjoy none of the protection against the arbitrary authority of their bishops which the "canon law" itself confers. This is a so-called "missionary country," in which the dioceses, however, are governed by canonical bishops, not by vicars apostolic; and the sixty-four bishops constitute a close corporation, with absolute power over the priests, who are thus mere slaves of episcopal domination. Further, the title to the entire Church property of each diocese is vested in the bishop in *fee simple*; and the laity are thus as powerless as the priests against him. Lastly, the

Catholic press is as completely under episcopal control as the priesthood and the laity. This absolute concentration of all substantial power, alike over pulpit, property, and press, makes the bishops the most thoroughly despotic body in the land, and gives them a degree of power greater than they possess in any other country. The appointment of Cardinal McCloskey has completed the structure of Catholic ecclesiastical absolutism, against which there is no powerful barrier except the general protective influences of free political and educational institutions. Whether this protection will prove adequate or not, or whether it must be supplemented by positive restrictive legislation, is a question for the future to decide. Unfortunately, the case is complicated by the existence of a rival, but much feebler spirit of propagandism among Protestant sects, which dangerously retards the establishment of that absolute separation of Church and State which is the vital principle of American republicanism.

Again, the wealth of the Catholic Church, which is the great weapon of its ambition, is accumulating, as I have already shown, far more rapidly than the general wealth of the country. By their individual tenure of all Church property, the bishops are enabled to manage it as they please; and they are shrewd enough to invest it as much as possible in real estate, holding it untaxed in consequence of the policy of exemption by which the States are preparing a bitter future for themselves, and leaving it to rise in value by the labours of the outside world. In addition to the constant contributions they collect in small sums from servant girls and other poor Catholics, they thus contrive to levy taxes on the general community, and put their hands into the pocket of every business man in the nation. History and experience go for nothing with the preoccupied and apathetic public, who submit to all this in the half-defined but insane notion that somehow or other the laws of nature are not the same here as in the Old World. Meanwhile the process continues, and the Roman Catholic Church is fast becoming the richest corporation in the land, with all its despotic money-power in the hands of an episcopal "Roman Ring," who use it in making it greater and more effective still for the overthrow of free institutions.

But greater than all these sources of strength put together, is the weakness of the public conscience and the unsuspectingness of the public intelligence. The people have too long submitted, half angrily, half lazily, to the control of caucus managers, petty rings, and utterly selfish politicians, who are all ready to make any sacrifice for immediate partisan success, and therefore to make any bargain, however corrupt, with those who hold the balance of power. Here is the unguarded point in the defences of the public freedom. It is this moral and mental weakness of the people themselves, their blindness to the duty of the hour or their criminal negligence in perform-

ing it, which makes the Catholic minority so dangerous to the country.

Such are the chief elements of power, though many more might be enumerated, possessed by the Roman Catholic Church in its assault on the public schools, and (through them) all free institutions. But the real peril lies less in the present actual extent of this power than in the character of the reaction excited by its direct assault on the system of State education. Catholic ambition is rousing Protestant Evangelical ambition to new and dangerous manifestations; and between these rivalries of religious fanaticism, each party aiming at political power, I believe that the institutions of the Republic are certain to be subjected to a strain severer than any they have hitherto experienced. There are three leading forms assumed by the distinctively Protestant reaction against Catholic assaults on the public school system:—

1. A movement to surrender State education altogether, and to fall back on a system of denominational schools. This movement, which adopts the Catholic premise that doctrinal religious education is paramount in importance to all other, and which has been to some extent carried out by the establishment of Church schools of various Protestant sects, has not been a very influential one hitherto. But its ideas have been stated with great force in the *New York Tribune* of December 9, 1875, by the Rev. John Miller, in a letter headed "State Schools a Mistake."

2. A movement to defend State education as now conducted, including reading of the Bible "without note or comment," and also Protestant hymns and prayers. This movement represents the fixed determination of the vast majority of Evangelical Protestants, as proved by the almost unanimous declarations of their ecclesiastical assemblages; although some influential journals whose orthodoxy is very imperfect—as, for instance, the *New York Christian Union* and *Independent*—are in favour of secular schools.

3. A movement to fortify the existing advantages of Evangelical Protestantism, both in the political and educational institutions of the nation, by securing the adoption of a doctrinal amendment of the United States constitution, incorporating into its preamble a distinct national recognition of Protestant Christianity. This movement, of which I shall speak again, is numerically weak, but represents the logical necessity to which the Evangelical party will be driven by events, if the agitation of the Catholic question continues.

These are the three phases of Protestant reaction, as such, against the aggressive activity of the Roman Catholic Church. Of course there are a great many individual members of the Protestant sects who favour the principle of absolutely secular education in our

public schools, and who will fail to act with their fellow-believers at the ballot-box. But, on the other hand, a great many persons who are totally disconnected with any Protestant sect, will be sure to vote in support of the Evangelical policy, whether from social, business, political, or other interested motives. Notwithstanding the wild and sanguine hopes of many liberals, and notwithstanding the loose boastfulness of superficial and flippant writers for the daily press, no intelligent observer can seriously doubt that the vast preponderance of political power is at present on the side of Evangelical Protestantism, whenever it chooses to assert itself at the polls; or that its strength lies chiefly in its rapidly consolidating organization, its wealth, its social supremacy, and its power to gratify or defeat political aspirations; or that its strength is relatively decreasing every day under the opposite encroachments of "Romanism and Infidelity" on its domain; or that the instinct of self-preservation, together with the natural conservatism of all power and wealth, will drive it to give desperate battle in defence of its existing privileges rather than submit to deprivation of them by either of the foes that hem it in. While the great struggle over the slavery question continued, public attention was withdrawn from religious issues to a large extent. But now there is no longer any question of universal, absorbing interest before the people which can be compared for a moment with the question—*What shall be the permanent religious character of American civilisation?* Every indication of the deeper currents of thought and feeling points to an approaching contest of unprecedented proportions in working out a practical solution of this mighty problem; and, roughly outlined, three great religious parties are now in the field, destined each to play a momentous part in the immediate future. The Centennial Year of the national existence marks the beginning of a political epoch, of unknown duration, in which religion is evidently to take the lead of all public issues; and these three parties are slowly gathering themselves together for a struggle that must be for ever memorable in the history of the race.

The first of these parties—the Roman Catholic Church—I have already sufficiently described as it exists in the United States. Its power has been sufficiently proved by the fact that it has deliberately selected the field of battle for the first great shock of arms—namely, the public school system. It has also selected its own time, and made the first attack in force, and compelled its antagonists to assume the defensive attitude.

The second of the three parties is the Protestant Evangelical party, not compacted into one powerful organization like the Catholic Church, but composed of several great sects, and a swarm of minor ones, and weakened by mutual jealousies, discordant interests, and rival ambitions. But, politically considered, it is very likely to unite on

some definite measure which shall be "unsectarian" as to its own component factions, yet "sectarian" as to both Catholics and "infidels," whom it dreads and hates as heartily as it does the Catholics. It has taken up the phrase, "non-sectarian schools," as its watchword; but by this it means the schools as now conducted, with Protestant prayers, hymns, and scriptures. The studied ambiguity of this phrase—which, properly interpreted, would satisfy the friends of positive or secular education, is one of the dangerous elements of the situation. That the present school system is rendered in the large and true sense sectarian by the support of Protestant worship, would be stoutly denied by the vast majority of Protestant Evangelicals; but they are prepared to fight to the death in defence of this strictly sectarian worship, as the flag of Protestantism floating over the public schools. • This was a leading issue in the Ohio campaign during the summer and autumn of 1875; and it promises to be a leading issue in the Presidential campaign of 1876. It is only by keeping the ambiguity of the word "sectarian" in mind that recent events can be understood in their full significance.

On September 29, at Des Moines, Iowa, President Grant made at the Reunion of the Army of the Tennessee, one of the most important speeches ever delivered in this country, for it marked the definite introduction of the school question into national politics. Taking his cue from this speech, the Hon. James G. Blaine, late Speaker of the House of Representatives, and a well-known aspirant for the Presidency, wrote a private letter to an Ohio friend, under date of October 20th, proposing a form of amendment to the Constitution. This letter was not published till more than a month later, when it made a great sensation; and on December 14th, Mr. Blaine formally proposed his amendment in the House, with slight modifications, as follows:—

"No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and no money raised by taxation in any State for the support of public schools, or derived from any public fund therefor or any public lands devoted thereto, shall ever be under the control of any religious sect; and no money or lands so devoted shall be divided among religious sects or denominations."

This amendment is a direct blow aimed at the Roman Catholic Church in the interest of Evangelical Protestantism; for, if passed, it will defeat the Catholic effort to get control of or else divide the school funds, and at the same time will leave the Protestants in undisturbed mastery of the schools themselves. Mr. Blaine's proposition is a pretty evident bid for the support of the Evangelical party in the approaching political contest. But the President, in his annual message to Congress, dated December 7th, had already recommended measures still more sweeping, which have astounded the country by their boldness, and perplexed all parties alike. They

include, among other things, the taxation of all Church property (with "possibly" the exception of Church edifices), the establishment of compulsory education so far as to make illiteracy a cause of disenfranchisement after 1890, and the formal declaration that Church and State shall be for ever separate and distinct. With reference to the schools, I quote his language:—

"As the primary step, therefore, to our advancement in all that has marked our progress in the past century, I suggest for your earnest consideration, and most earnestly recommend it, that a Constitutional Amendment be submitted to the legislatures of the several States for ratification, making it the duty of the several States to establish, and forever maintain, free public schools adequate to the education of all the children in the rudimentary branches within their respective limits, irrespective of sex, colour, birthplace, or religion, forbidding the teaching in said schools of religious, atheistic, or Pagan tenets, and prohibiting the granting of any school funds or school taxes, or any part thereof, either by legislative, municipal, or other authority, for the benefit, or in aid, directly or indirectly, of any religious sect or denomination, or in aid, or for the benefit of any other object of any nature or kind whatever."

It is at present uncertain whether the President means to include Protestant worship under "teaching religious tenets;" but the courts could hardly construe the phrase so strictly. His language, like Mr. Blaine's, is open to more than a single construction; and it would hardly be just to insist on any particular one. Unfortunately, ambiguous phraseology is no new thing in American politics. But the floodgates are opened, and the public must be prepared for a deluge of propositions to amend the Constitution. It is a grave and anxious time for patriots. The school question is now fairly up for discussion and decision, and the form it has inevitably taken—that of a constitutional amendment—cannot fail to call public attention to another proposed amendment, which has been lying for years like a lighted slow-match near a powder-magazine.

The Protestant Evangelical party are evidently determined not to consent to the thorough secularization of the school system; they are doggedly resolved to keep the Bible in the schools. Starting with this foregone conclusion, there is an extreme left wing of the party which discerns the defective legal guarantees for the perpetuation of religious worship in the schools, and is shrewd enough to see that there is no way to perpetuate it without some formal recognition of Protestant Christianity in the fundamental law of the land. Every great question, like the slavery question, must be finally settled in this country by a constitutional amendment. To "defend the existing Christian features of the government" (for, notwithstanding the theoretical separation of Church and State, we have many such "survivals" of a pre-national period), these long-headed men, with the enthusiasm which is easily generated by clear conviction in logical minds, declare the absolute necessity to their cause of some adequate change in the Constitution, which is, thanks to the wisdom of its heterodox framers, a purely secular document from beginning

to end, and contains not a clause or word by which, in the United States' Courts, the "Christian features" alluded to could possibly be defended against a strong effort for their abolition. Consequently they propose to amend the preamble of the Constitution, which is its enacting clause, so as "suitably to express our national recognition of Almighty God as the author of national existence and the source of all power and authority in civil government, of Jesus Christ as the Ruler of nations, and of the Bible as the fountain of law, and the supreme rule for the conduct of nations."

"The birth of the movement for this purpose," says the Rev. David MacAllister, one of the leaders of it, "may be dated from the 4th day of February, 1863." Its first convention was held at Xenia, Ohio; and a similar convention, without any knowledge of the other, was held at Sparta, Illinois, on February 6th, of the same year. Since then, numerous conventions have been held in different parts of the country on behalf of the movement, and have been usually largely attended and widely reported. United States' Senators, Governors, Judges of the Supreme Courts of the United States and of many States and territories, presidents and professors of colleges, bishops and clergymen of many denominations, and numerous dignitaries of all sorts, have been found to lend the sanction of their names to these conventions and the object for which they are held. A weekly journal is published in Philadelphia as the organ of the movement, called the *Christian Statesman*, and edited by the Rev. T. P. Stevenson, an able and earnest man. A National Reform Association is about to be incorporated for the more effectual prosecution of the cause. Public petitions for this "Christian Amendment," as it has been appropriately designated by those who perceive that its real object is to make Christianity the established religion of the United States, have long been circulating for signature; and it has been declared that 2,000,000 signatures are to be collected and presented to Congress in its support by the next 4th of July. That this movement is a thoroughly vital one, and certain sooner or later to create a fanatical enthusiasm of a very dangerous character, I became more than ever profoundly convinced on attending the national convention of these men at Cincinnati in 1872. It is a movement strong with all the strength of fixed moral purpose and of logic applied unanswerably to the universally accepted premises of the Evangelical Protestant faith; and now that the time is evidently drawing near for amending the Constitution with reference to the religious issue, those who are determined to keep the banner of Protestant Christianity flying over the public schools will soon come to see that they cannot ultimately succeed except through the success of this Christian Amendment. All that is wanting is to "fire the Evangelical heart;" and if the aggressiveness of Rome cannot

do this, nothing can. President Grant's proposed amendment is not enough; Mr. Blaine's is not enough; nothing but this thorough-going Christian Amendment will impregnably fortify the Bible in the schools. The brain and the soul of the whole Protestant party are in this body of extremists—this squad of determined soldiers of the Cross, who have carried on undauntedly 'their weary thirteen years' warfare in the face of indifference and opposition; and now see the decisive hour approaching. I know the tone of intense moral enthusiasm, as every one does who ever heard Garrison and Phillips and their followers in the anti-slavery warfare; and it is a perilous thing for liberty when a manifest spirit like that of the "original abolitionists" can be enlisted in the cause of a Christian Amendment. For this measure means disfranchisement and disability to hold office for every conscientious free-thinker; and that means the concentration of all political power in the hands of bigots with conscience, or hypocrites without it; and that must mean, in the end, a million-fold more cruel civil war than the one that so lately filled the land with blood and with tears. Need more be said?

This, then, is the Catholic peril in America—not alone that the Roman Catholic Church may become a ruling majority, or (what is worse) a ruling minority, with all the measureless miseries and mischiefs of such rule, but that, in order to strengthen the Republic against the possibility of such rulership, the great Protestant party may resort to measures involving a revolutionary subversion of the fundamental principle of the Republic itself. For a hundred years our national life has been slowly developing into a more complete accordance with the principle that the Church and the State can be and ought to be wholly separate. To reverse this principle now would be national ruin—a melancholy failure of the experiment of establishing a great civilisation on universal reverence for the rights of man. It would not be our loss alone, but the world's as well; for the vitality of American institutions is in their strictly universal and cosmopolitan character, and in their adaptability to every community which has reached a certain average of popular intelligence and independence of character.

To defeat all such changes, and to carry forward to a higher, fuller, and nobler realisation the national ideal of a purely secular government, is the one object of the third great party of which I spoke. By this term I mean the vast unorganized body of all those who accept in its fulness the conception of a State absolutely emancipated from all ecclesiastical dictation or influence, and who intelligently defend the total separation of State and Church. Many such may be found, doubtless, among the nominal Protestants—a few among the nominal Catholics; but the great majority are unconnected with ecclesiastical organizations. In this age of slowly disintegrating beliefs,

the positive conception of a purely secular or civil State finds a hearty welcome in many minds which are not yet wholly rid of all contradictory conceptions; the contradictions, however, may be unconsciously harboured and practically inoperative, so far as conduct is concerned. All such are Liberals, in the broad sense I intend; and the true Liberal party must be held to include all citizens who comprehend and embrace the principle of absolutely secular government, whatever their opinions may be in religious matters.

Now this great third party, being unorganized, is of yet undetermined strength. For the first time in our national history, questions are arising for solution at the polls which will reveal its actual numbers and power. But their political programme, enumerating the points on which reform is actually required in order to render the State totally secular in its administration as well as in its theory, has been drawn up as follows in the so-called "Demands of Liberalism":—

"1. We demand that churches and other ecclesiastical property shall no longer be exempt from just taxation.

"2. We demand that the employment of chaplains in Congress, in State Legislatures, in the navy and militia, and in prisons, asylums, and all other institutions supported by public money, shall be discontinued.

"3. We demand that all public appropriations for educational and charitable institutions of a sectarian character shall cease.

"4. We demand that all religious services now sustained by the government shall be abolished; and especially that the use of the Bible in the public schools, whether ostensibly as a text-book or avowedly as a book of religious worship, shall be prohibited.

"5. We demand that the appointment, by the President of the United States or by the Governors of the various States, of all religious festivals and fasts shall wholly cease.

"6. We demand that the judicial oath in the courts and in all other departments of the government shall be abolished, and that simple affirmation under the pains and penalties of perjury shall be established in its stead."

"7. We demand that all laws directly or indirectly enforcing the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath shall be repealed.

"8. We demand that all laws looking to the enforcement of 'Christian' morality shall be abrogated, and that all laws shall be conformed to the requirements of natural morality, equal rights, and impartial liberty.

"9. We demand that not only in the Constitutions of the United States and of the several States, but also in the practical administration of the same, no privilege or advantage shall be conceded to Christianity or any other special religion; that our entire political system shall be founded and administered on a purely secular basis; and that whatever changes shall prove necessary to this end shall be consistently, unflinchingly, and promptly made."

These "Demands of Liberalism," originally published in the *Index* (a weekly journal now printed in Boston), on April 6, 1872, have been copied and scattered all over the country through other publications. Early in 1873 "Liberal Leagues" began to be organized on them as a basis of action, and now number at least thirty, and

probably more ; but they have accomplished little in the way of tangible results. In fact, the time is hardly yet arrived for opportunities of efficient action.

Although the actual organization of this party is as yet inconsiderable, no thoughtful man will from this circumstance draw any augury as to its future ; he will rather study closely the principles it represents, and its necessary relation to the issues which, as I have shown, are already compelling the attention of President, Congress, and people. It is absolutely impossible that the religious agitation into which the Catholic attack on the schools has precipitated the people of the United States, should long continue, without calling out from an immense party some powerful affirmation of the fundamental principle which is expressed in the first of the above resolutions. I believe that this party will speedily be a majority of the whole people. Even the Protestant Evangelical party are accustomed to accept this principle verbally ; what is wanted is to convince them of the necessity of its thorough practical application.

Two representative gatherings are to be held in Philadelphia, at the great Centennial Exposition of 1876, which will bring out in bold, dramatic, and almost startling opposition the antagonistic ideas now agitating the nation. The advocates of the Christian Amendment of the Constitution have called a great convention in support of that ominous measure, and will appeal to the now rapidly reviving bigotry of the Protestant party to take the only step which can perpetuate their present power. The advocates of the "Demands of Liberalism" and the "Religious Freedom Amendment," have also called a convention in support of the movement for thorough secularization of the State, and will appeal to the enlightened patriotism of all American citizens to carry out the measures which may be necessary to that great end. The one convention would undo the work of the forefathers, and prevail upon the children to abandon for ever the great principle of the divorce of Church and State, by which the Republic has thus far prospered, in order to restore the antiquated mischief of a State taking its laws from the Church. The other convention would fulfil and perfect the forefathers' work, and prevail upon the children to complete the structure they have inherited, by carrying the same great principle to its consummation in a State whose fundamental law shall be the natural reason and conscience of the people, without a vestige of supernaturalism in its government or administration. In the vast crowd of other interests and excitements, both these conventions may pass comparatively without notice at the time ; but the future student of history may yet point back to them as the negative and positive electrodes of a great battery of moral forces, and note here the first spark of a discharge destined to shake a continent to its foundations.

FRANCIS E. ABBOTT.

THE WEDDAS.

THE Weddas,¹ or, as they are more commonly but inaccurately called, the Veddas of Ceylon, occupy a portion of the island lying to the east of the hills of the Uva and Medamahanuwara districts, about ninety miles in length and forty in breadth. They have been described by Sir Emerson Tennent in his work on Ceylon,² and by Mr. Bailey in a paper printed in the Journal³ of the Ethnological Society; but, interesting as their accounts are, the latter has suffered grievously from misprints, and the value of the former is impaired by the circumstance that its materials were not the fruit of original research. The excellent works of Dr. Davy, Percival, Cordiner, and others, do not give any full information regarding the Weddas; and the references to them in Knox's history of his captivity, and in the remarkable account of the travels of Ibn Batuta, the Moor, in the early part of the fourteenth century, are curious rather than precise.

The only real division of the Weddas places them in two classes—the Kelé Weddo, or Jungle Weddas; and the Gan Weddo, or semi-civilised Village Weddas; and the attention of the ethnologist should be almost exclusively directed to the former. It may be added that the terms Rock Weddas, Tree Weddas, and Coast Weddas, are unscientific and meaningless, and merely involve a cross division.

The relative numbers of the two classes must be merely a matter of guesswork, for their nomadic habits have rendered any enumeration of them impossible. Sir Emerson Tennent states that their entire number was estimated at eight thousand, but that was a mere conjecture, and probably an exaggerated one. Mr. Bailey, on the other hand, reckoned the total number of Jungle Weddas, in 1858, at three hundred and eighty only, and it is probably less than that at the present time.

He discriminates those which are found in the district of Nilgala from those belonging to a tract of country called Bintenna, but the difference is clearly only geographical, the customs, physical appearance and dialect of the two tribes being precisely identical. Tacit agreement and immemorial use have led them to confine themselves exclusively to particular tracts of the vast extent of forest which

(1) The term signifies "an archer," or "one who shoots," cf. the Sidatsangarawa and the Nāmāvali, wherein the etymology of the word is fully explained. The corresponding Sanskrit term is Vyādha, which Wilson explains to mean "a hunter, or one who lives by killing deer," &c.

(2) "Ceylon," vol. ii. p. 437, et seq.

(3) "Transactions," New Series, vol. ii.

they regard as their prescriptive and inalienable property, and a member of one division of the tribe very rarely comes in contact with another. A gentleman who once witnessed a meeting between some of the members of the two different clans observed that they were mutually embarrassed at the unexpected sight of each other. They peered inquisitively with an expression of mingled suspicion and astonishment, and manifested every disinclination to associate together. A somewhat similar effect was produced when a jungle Wedda was shown a looking-glass. He appeared at first to be terrified and annoyed, but afterwards looked behind it and round about in a puzzled and wondering manner with his hand upon his axe as if preparing to defend himself. Five or six others to whom the glass was successively shown displayed similar gestures, and made use of exactly the same expressions, asking, in a loud and excited tone, the meaning of the strange phenomenon.

The Village Weddas may be differentiated from the others rather by their habits of life than by any physical peculiarities. Their occasional contact with more civilised races has insensibly led them to cultivate land and to construct houses; and during late years an attempt has been made to introduce Christianity and a system of education among them.

The Jungle Weddas, on the other hand, as is well known, have no sort of dwelling-houses, and pass their lives entirely in the open air. They take shelter from a storm under a rock or inside a hollow tree, if one is at hand; and as they are constantly roaming about in their forest country, their manner of life makes it impossible for them to attempt any sort of cultivation. Their food, which they always cook, is very poor. It consists chiefly of honey, iguanas, and talagoyas, or the flesh of the wandura monkey, the deer, and the wild boar, for the supply of which they depend mainly upon their skill with the bow and arrow. They are, however, assisted in their hunting by their dogs, which are called by distinctive names, and are the only domesticated animals which they possess. They drink nothing but water, and, although they habitually chew the bark of certain trees, they never smoke or use tobacco in any way. The tallest Wedda measured by Mr. Bailey was 5 feet 3 inches, and the shortest 4 feet 1 inch. I found one, however, apparently about eighteen years of age, who was 5 feet $4\frac{3}{4}$ inches. But notwithstanding their small size and their slight physique, the strength which they possess in the arms, and especially in the left arm, is very remarkable. It is probable that this is due to their constant use of the bow, upon which they chiefly depend for their supply of food. It is about 6 feet long, and has generally a pull of from 45 or 48 to about 56 lbs. It therefore requires no ordinary strength to draw the arrow, which is 3 feet 6 inches in length, up to the end; but they



invariably do this, and then take a careful and steady aim before letting it go. The annexed measurements¹ of two Weddas will perhaps show, with more clearness than any general description, the relative dimensions of fairly average specimens of the race. One of them (Latty) was able to hold his bow drawn to its full length for upwards of two minutes, without the slightest tremor of the left arm. They are, as a rule, good shots; and upon one occasion (in February, 1872) I saw a Wedda bring down a Pariah dog at a distance of thirty-five yards when it was running away. He took very deliberate aim, and the arrow passed through nearly the whole length of the animal, entering at the hinder quarter and coming out through the fore shoulder.

Sir Emerson Tennent and Mr. Bailey thought them indifferent marksmen; and the former² states that they occasionally use their feet for drawing the bow, but at the present time, at any rate, this practice is entirely unknown, and it is difficult to understand how or why it ever could have existed. They have, in fact, no exceptional prehensile power in their feet, and they are bad climbers. Their bodies are in no way hirsute, nor is there any especial tendency to convergence of the hair towards the elbows, or to divergence from the knees, or *vice versa*.

With the exception of their bows and arrows, their only weapon is a small axe, but there is no trace of the use of any flint or stone implements at any period of their history, although it is observable that the word which they use for axe³ implies the notion of something made of stone, and in this instance the ethnological value of language is probably shown by the survival in an expression of an idea which would otherwise have long ago been forgotten.

The arrows are made of the wood of the welan tree (*pterospermum suberifolium*) which is also used for the purpose of kindling fire by means of friction, a practice which still has existence amongst them, although they generally have recourse to the flint and steel

(1) *Latty*. Age about 18. Height, 5 feet 4½ inches. From top of forehead to bottom of chin, 6½ inches. Across face 6½ inches. Shoulder to elbow, 11 inches. From elbow to wrist, 10 inches, and on to end of middle finger, 7½ inches. Round biceps of right arm, 10½ inches. Round biceps of left arm, 10½ inches. Round muscle of right forearm, 8½ inches. Round muscle of left forearm, 8½ inches. Round chest, 31 inches. Length of thigh, 16½ inches. From knee to ankle, 16½ inches. Calf of leg in girth, 11½ inches. Sole of foot, 9½ inches. Round head at the middle of the forehead, 20½ inches.

Bandiey. Age about 25. Height, 4 feet 11½ inches. From top of forehead to bottom of chin, 7 inches. Across face, 6½ inches. Shoulder to elbow 12½ inches. From elbow to wrist, 8½ inches, and on to end of middle finger, 6½ inches. Round biceps of right arm, 9½ inches. Round biceps of left arm, 9½ inches. Round muscle of right forearm, 8½ inches. Round muscle of left forearm, 8½ inches. Round chest, 29½ inches. Length of thigh, 16½ inches. From knee to ankle, 16½ inches. Calf of leg in girth, 11½ inches. Sole of foot, 8½ inches. Round head at middle of forehead, 20½ inches.

(2) "Ceylon," vol. i. 499; ii. 439.

(3) *Se*. Galrekki, Gala being the Sinhalese word for stone or rock.

by striking the head of their axe or the point of their arrow with some flint substance. They usually obtain their axes and arrow-heads from the Moors who live in the villages adjacent to that part of the country which they inhabit in exchange for hides or beeswax, but the system of secret barter to which Sir Emerson Tennent refers¹ is unknown at the present day. The long iron arrow-heads are similarly obtained from the Moors, and are regarded as heir-looms, descending from father to son and being regarded as possessions of great value by reason of their scarceness, and indeed the arrow not unfrequently consists of merely a sharply-pointed piece of wood with the usual feathers of the wild pea-fowl attached to it.

The general appearance of the Weddas may be described as distinctly non-Aryan. The comparative shortness of their thumbs and their sharply-pointed elbows are worthy of remark, as well as their flat noses and in some cases thick lips, features which at once distinguish them in a marked degree from the oriental races living in their vicinity. Yet their countenances are not absolutely devoid of intelligence, but their coarse flowing hair, their scanty clothing, and their systematic neglect of any kind of ablution present a picture of extreme barbarism. The women wear necklaces and, in common with the men, ornaments in the ears, for which purpose beads are highly valued as well as empty cartridge cases, with which they appear to be greatly pleased, but they have no fondness for bright colours or appreciation of their differences, and it is to be noticed that there is no word in their language for any one of the colours.

They habitually refrain from the use of water except for drinking purposes, upon the ground that the washing of themselves would make them weak, and whilst they speak in an excessively loud and fierce tone of voice, and wear an expression of great unhappiness, it is a remarkable circumstance that they never laugh. They have, nevertheless, that which Juvenal called² the finest element in the human character, for they are tender-hearted and can give way to tears. This absence of any disposition to laughter has not been noticed by any one who has yet written upon the Weddas, and it is odd that such a peculiar characteristic should not have been hitherto recorded, for it is a fact well known to the intelligent Sinhalese in the Kandyan districts, and it is certainly deserving of attention. The causes which provoke laughter are doubtless different in different individuals, but every conceivable method for arousing it has been tried upon the Weddas without success, and it was found

(1) "Ceylon," vol. i. 568; vol. ii. 440.

(2) "Mollissima corda

Humano generi dare se natura fatetur

Quæ lacrymas dedit; hæc nostri pars optima sensus."—*Sat.* xv. 133.

that the sight of another person laughing produced in them a feeling of unmistakable disgust; upon being asked whether they ever laughed, they replied, "No, why should we? What is there to laugh at?"

There does not seem to be anything in their physical structure or conformation which accounts for this abnormal temperament. It is possible that constant disuse may have caused a certain atrophy and want of power in the muscles of the face which has increased in successive generations, and is analogous to the exceptional development of the strength of the left arm, but from a psychological point of view it may be that their wild habits of life and the total isolation from the rest of the world to which they have been subjected for countless generations have completely deadened in them a susceptibility to external influences, if indeed laughter is exclusively referable to principles of empirical and sensuous nature.

The philosopher Hobbes ascribed it to a feeling of superiority or self-approbation, the result of an act of comparison; and Aristotle seems to have thought that it arose from a sense of something incongruous, unexpected, or sudden.¹ The peculiar test which he mentions was applied to a Wedda, but without success. It may be borne in mind that as a rule all Oriental nations dislike laughter, and that there is no instance of a happy or good-natured laugh recorded in the Bible; and it is noticeable that it is a common practice of the Kandyan Sinhalese to cover their mouth with their hand or to turn away when they laugh, as if they were ashamed. The general subject of laughter has been very fully and ably discussed by Mr. Darwin in his last work, *The Expression of the Emotions*. "It is," he says, "primarily the expression of mere joy or happiness;" and, although the most prevalent and frequent of all the emotional expressions in idiots, it is never to be observed in those who are morose, passionate, or utterly stolid."²

Instances have been known in which the muscle, designated *zygomaticus minor*, which is one of those which are more especially brought into play by the act of laughing, has been entirely absent from the anatomical structure of the human face;³ but it is unlikely that a similar formation should characterize a whole race of people, and no real Wedda has ever yet been subjected to a process of anatomy. An effort was lately made to provoke laughter from five members of the tribe, who are alleged to have been authentic speci-

(1) Διάτι αὐτὸς αὐτὸν οὐδεὶς γαργαλίζει; "Ἡ ὅτι καὶ ὅπ' ἄλλου ἦττον ἰὰν προαίσθηται, μᾶλλον δ' ἂν μὴ ὀρᾷ; ὥσθ' ἤκιστα γαργαλισθήσεται, ὅταν μὴ λανθάνῃ τοῦτο πάσχων. Ἔστι δὲ ὁ γέλως παρακοπή τις καὶ ἀπάτη δι' ὃ καὶ τυπτόμενοι εἰς τὰς φρένας γελῶσιν. οὐ γὰρ ὁ τυχὼν τόπος ἴσθιν ὧ γελῶσιν—τό δὲ λαθρῶιον ἀπατητικόν. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ γίνεται ὁ γέλως καὶ οὐ γίνεται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.—Aristotle, *Problems*, xxxv. 6.

(2) "The Expression of the Emotions," p. 198, and cf. also Bain on the "Emotions and the Will," 1866, p. 247.

(3) See Quain's "Anatomy," vol. i. p. 176 (7th edition).

mens of the Jungle Weddas, and who were exhibited to H. R. H. the Prince of Wales on the occasion of his recent visit to Ceylon. They consisted of two men and three women; two of the women were very gentle in appearance, and one is reported to have been decidedly pretty. The two men were described as small and rather ape-like, and are said to have shot fairly well at a mark with their bows and arrows, but "at the command of the missionary," they grinned horribly.

The experiment of attempting to make them laugh under such conditions as these would have been obviously of no value whatever, even if it had been successful.

But the description given of them in the local newspapers and by various special correspondents with some minuteness and diligence leaves no doubt that they were brought from the district of Batticaloa, where the few remaining Weddas, partly owing to the influence of missionaries and partly to frequent intermarriages with Tamils, have lost many of the distinguishing features of their primitive condition. It may be well to observe that it is entirely erroneous to speak of any Weddas as belonging to "a very savage hill tribe," as they were described, probably upon the mistaken idea of an analogy between them and some of the aboriginal tribes of India. The country which they inhabit is low-lying and comparatively flat forest-land, which in no part rises to an elevation of much more than two hundred feet above the sea level, and it is characteristic of none but the village Weddas to live in huts.

A curious and comprehensive memorandum upon the Weddas of the Batticaloa district, furnished by one of the chief native officials in 1872, explains that those which belong to that part of the country generally construct temporary buildings to live in, which are cross-tied with the bark of the Halmilla tree, and roofed with illuk grass, but that they abandon them from time to time when they have occasion to resort elsewhere for food or water. They are designated by Tamil names of Manalkadu, or Sandy-jungle Weddas, and Cholaikkadu Weddas respectively; the former term applying to those who inhabit the country near to the seacoast, cultivating chena lands and speaking the Tamil language; and the latter to those who are nomads, and still retain some of their pristine barbarism; and he bears testimony to the important fact that the wilder and less civilised Weddas of the remote parts of the Binteenno district are an entirely distinct class, and utterly unable to count. It is unfortunate that the representatives of the aboriginal race should have been selected from that portion of the country where they are really found only in name, and that they should have been then subjected to several weeks' training in the art of laughter.

An instance, adduced by Mr. R. Downall, of a Wedda who was

able to laugh remains to be adverted to, particularly as it has given rise to the somewhat hasty generalisation that all jungle Weddas are able to do so heartily. He records that when he was on a shooting expedition a few years ago, he set up his hat as a mark for the Wedda who was acting as his shikari to aim at with his arrows, one evening after his return from the day's shooting. The Wedda at once succeeded in sending an arrow through the hat, and then, it is said, joined in the laugh which was raised against its owner. This evidence, coming, as it does, from a gentleman whose statements are most thoroughly deserving of attention and respect, nevertheless loses much of its value from the absence of any specific information regarding the locality to which the Wedda belonged, and the degree of civilisation to which he had attained. It is, however, clear that he had for some time been associated with the Tarnils and others who formed the shooting party; and it is easily conceivable that amidst the general laughter he may have been supposed to have joined, for it was in no way suspected that he would not do so by the gentleman, who naturally kept no record whatever of the occurrence, and wrote from his recollection of the incident some years after it took place.

It may also be mentioned that the Wedda Latty, who has been previously referred to, displayed excessive anger and exhibited a morose expression when he succeeded in hitting the Pariah dog at which he aimed.

Moroseness may indeed be said to be traceable in many of their countenances, no less than in the tones of their voices, but there is no ground for considering it to be really inherent in their character, which is remarkable for kindness of disposition, and elevated by a universal sentiment of satisfaction with their condition, and a consciousness of superiority to their more civilised neighbours. They would exchange their wild forest life for none other, and it was with the utmost difficulty that they could be induced to quit even for a short time their favourite solitude.

It was an experiment of much interest to observe the effect produced by each successive object as it made its impression for the first time upon their minds, untaught as they were by previous experience of anything besides the mere phenomena of nature. A party of five were upon the first occasion simultaneously brought from their forests. The sight of a brick-built house surprised them, but the first wheeled vehicle they saw filled them with alarm and terror, and as they bent eagerly forward to scrutinize it they instinctively grasped the handles of their axes. The various articles of food which were offered to them were unhesitatingly rejected, and they were with difficulty persuaded at length to eat boiled rice, which they at first seemed to fear would make them intoxicated or stupefied. After a time, however, they became fond of it and eat it

in large quantities with a considerable admixture of salt, with which they expressed themselves highly gratified. They declared that the taste of salt was entirely new to them, and upon their return to their forests they expressly asked that they might be allowed to carry with them in preference to anything else as large a supply as they could transport. A similar taste was subsequently shown by other parties of jungle Weddas both in their forests and also when they were brought away for purposes of observation and inquiry.

Tobacco, which the Village Weddas occasionally use, was contemptuously refused by the jungle Weddas, who called it merely "dry leaves," and betel, and other favourite narcotics of the Sinhalese people were persistently declined.

The intellectual capacity of the Weddas is as low as it can possibly be in any persons endowed with reason. They are wholly unable to count or to comprehend the significance of number; they have no words to denote the ideas of one, or two, or three, nor do they even use their fingers for this purpose; and the chief difficulty in obtaining any information from them arose from their inability to form any but the most simple mental synthesis, and from their very defective power of memory. One of them, called Kôwy, had entirely forgotten the names of his father and of his mother, who were both dead, and only recollected the name of his wife, whom he had seen only three days previously, by a great effort, and after a long interval of consideration.

There is an interesting account given in an appendix to a report by Mr. Green upon the Welikada convict establishment, of a Wedda who had been tried for murder, and had received a commutation of his capital sentence to imprisonment with hard labour in chains. Mr. Green considered him to be a village Wedda, and it was found, on his admission into the jail, that he was able to count six. A native newspaper, called the *Lanka Nilhâna*, contained a report of his trial, in which he was described as "a Wedda, or wild man," and it appeared that he had killed another Wedda because he believed that he had destroyed two of his dogs by means of witchcraft. He was found guilty of murder, but the jury prayed for mercy towards him, as he was as ignorant as a beast. The force of this reason became apparent when, after regularly attending the prison school for three months, he had only succeeded in learning nine letters of the Sinhalese alphabet, and extending his knowledge of numbers to counting eighteen. He had no idea of a soul, of a Supreme Being, or of a future state. He thought there was no existence after death; he was conscious of no difference between himself and the wild beasts which roamed through the forest; and the only thing which he knew for certain was that the sun rose in the morning, and in the evening the darkness came on. He had, however, heard some one speak of a

Superior Being, called Wallyhami, but could not say whether it was a god or a devil, a good or an evil spirit; he was not afraid of it, nor did he pray to it. It seems probable that he was in this instance alluding to the deity Skanda, the Hindu personification of Ares (*Ἄρης*), known in Ceylon as Kandaswāmi, who, according to the Sinhalese myth, married a Wedda princess named Walli Amma, under whose peculiar care the Weddas were in consequence assumed to be placed.

It appeared from an ola, or book consisting of palm-leaves, inscribed by a stilus, which was in the possession of one of the Kandyan chiefs, that this personage was the offspring of Vishnu. The ola, which bears no date, nor the name of its author, states that the celebrated temple known as the Kataragama Dewale was built by the famous Sinhalese king, Dutugemunu, the conqueror of the Tamils, who reigned B.C. 160, and who appointed the Weddas as servants of the god on account of the purity of their caste. The princess, having been miraculously born, was discovered by the Weddas in their hunting excursions and grew up under their care. She became remarkable for her beauty and her charms, and captivated the god Skanda, to whom the Kataragama temple was dedicated. He assumed the disguise of a religious Ascetic, and offered her his hand, which she indignantly refused. The god thereupon went to his brother Ganesa, the god of wisdom, and asked for his assistance, which he at once lent by taking the form of a huge elephant and frightening the maiden. She fled for help to her rejected suitor, who after much entreaty consented to protect her on condition that she became his wife. She agreed and went with him, but the Weddas chased after them and shot at them with their arrows which fell at their feet without effect. He then discharged an arrow at the Weddas and thousands of them fell dead on the spot, but upon the intercession of the damsel, the god, reassuming his proper form, restored them to life, and then married her under the name of Walli Amma.

The merest outlines of this tradition are utterly unknown to the jungle Weddas, and it is doubtful whether many of them had ever heard even the name of the tutelary deity, who represented to the unfortunate prisoner above referred to little more than the principle and personification of the unknown.

Although it is probable that he belonged to the class of Village Weddas, it would appear from the statements which he made, that he was thoroughly conversant with the customs and ideas of the more barbarous Jungle Weddas, and indeed it is not unlikely that he was an instance of a member of the latter class who had by some means become degenerated into the former. His slight knowledge of numbers was evidently due to the efforts of missionaries or other

persons who endeavoured shortly before the time of his imprisonment to educate his people. It would perhaps be unfair to attribute to a similar influence the commission of the act of violence which resulted in his trial for murder; but it is worthy of consideration whether the condition of a race barbarous indeed, but nevertheless rejoicing in a complete and long-established immunity from crime, is likely to be enlightened by the benefits of western morality and civilisation.

He seems to have been considerably expert in the use of the bow and arrows, having frequently killed as many as half-a-dozen deer in a day, and upon two occasions an elephant; but when he made trial of his skill with those weapons in the prison he was somewhat unsuccessful. He accounted for his failure by his want of practice with a bow and arrows new and strange to him, and his extreme weakness consequent upon an attack of dysentery; when he was prostrated by this disorder he refused all sort of nourishment and his recovery was attributed in a great measure to his entire abstinence from food. He continually made piteous appeals to go to his wife and children, and to be taken from the prison where there was so much light and heat and glare to some place where he could lie under the shade of trees and green leaves. It is gratifying to be able to add, that owing to the kind and humane consideration of His Excellency Lord Torrington, the governor, he was released after a short period of incarceration.

The diseases from which all Weddas more particularly suffer are dysentery and fever; and it would seem that the effects of the former have been from time to time exceedingly disastrous. The remedies which they adopt for it, consist in pounding the astringent bark of certain trees which they generally use for chewing and mixing the juice with water which they then drink. In cases of fever they drink warm water, as is the very general custom of the Sinhalese people, and also pour it over the body. Their only surgical implement is the sharp blade of the long spearlike arrow-head, and this is used in cases of midwifery, wherein the husband is alone the operator.

Far from exhibiting any tendency to Pantheistic or the simpler forms of nature worship, as some writers have supposed, the jungle Weddas appear to be almost devoid of any sentiment of religion; they are not even acquainted with the name of Buddha, or the theory of metempsychosis; they have no temples, priests, festivals, or games, but their belief is limited by the notion that after death they become *yakko*, or devils, and herein may be traced their unquestioned identity with the Autochthones, of whom an account is given in the ancient chronicles of Ceylon.¹ When one of them dies, the body is wrapped in the hide of a deer, if such a thing be at the time pro-

(1) Cf. "The Mahawanso," ch. vii.

curable, and a grave is dug with their hatchets and with pointed sticks. This service is performed exclusively by the males, no female being ever present on such an occasion; nothing is put into the grave with the body, and after it has been covered over, the spot where it lies, apparently from mingled motives of fear and sorrow, is never revisited. An offering is then made to the departed spirit which has become a devil, in order that it may not torment the survivors with fever; it consists of the flesh of the wandura, or monkey, and the talagoya, added to a quantity of honey and some esculent roots, which are all roasted together, while the senior member of the family of the deceased repeats the simple formula, "Malagi etto topan me kewili lapaw," or, "Ye dead persons, take ye these food offerings," and then divides the whole of it amongst himself and those who are present, by whom it is eaten. In this custom there may possibly be traced the faint germs of a religion; and it is of peculiar ethnological significance if, as has been maintained, the earliest form which religion took consisted in the propitiation of the spirits of deceased ancestors.

The moral characteristics of the Weddas exhibit, as may be supposed, the simplest workings of the unreflecting and subjective will, not regulated by law nor conditioned by experience. They think it perfectly inconceivable that any person should ever take that which does not belong to him, or strike his fellow, or say anything that is untrue. The practice of polygamy and polyandry which still exists to some extent amongst their neighbours, the Sinhalese, is to them entirely unknown. Marriage is, nevertheless, allowed with sisters and with daughters, but never with the eldest sister, and in all cases they are remarkable for constancy to their wives and affection for their children. The practice of marrying sisters is not yet extinct, as Mr. Bailey supposed, amongst the Weddas of Bintenna, for in the year 1872 there was a living instance in the person of one named Wanniya, who had married his sister Latti; he was about twenty years of age, and had one child. It appeared that no one but Wanniya himself, and not even his brother, was ever allowed to go near his wife or child, or to supply them with any food.

A marriage is attended with no ceremony beyond the presentation of some food to the parents of the bride, who is not herself allowed the exercise of any choice in the selection of her husband, and in this respect, as in some others, the subjection of women is complete. A woman is never recognised as the head of a family, nor is she admitted to any participation in the ceremony attending the offering made to the spirits of the dead. The eldest male Wedda is regarded with a sort of patriarchal respect when accident or occasion has brought together any others than the members of one family, but all the rest are considered as equals, and the distinctions of caste are

not known. The Kandians universally agree that they all belong to the royal caste, and it is said that they used to address the king by the now obsolete title "Hura," or cousin, the term which they applied to myself in conversation.

Their language is a subject which demanded the most particular care and attention, but I reserve for the present any full account of it. It unfortunately possesses no written characters, and, owing to its limited vocabulary, which embraces merely the most elementary concepts, as well as to the difficulty of communicating with people so singularly unintelligent as the Weddas, the results which have been obtained may perhaps not be considered thoroughly conclusive or satisfactory. Their charms or folk-lore show a resemblance to Elu, but they are extremely difficult to translate, and their precise object and signification is for the most part undefined. The list of proper names contains, as Mr. Bailey has observed, some which are in use among the Sinhalese, but high caste and low caste names are indiscriminately jumbled together; others are names common to Tamils, while a large number are entirely unknown to Sinhalese or Tamils, and of these a portion are in common use in Bengal, and belong to Hindu deities or personages mentioned in the Purānas. Besides the words which indicate an affinity with Sinhalese, there are others which are allied with Pali and with Sanskrit, and an important residue of doubtful origin; but it is worthy of remark that from beginning to end the vocabulary is characterized by an absence of any distinctly Dravidian element, and that it appears to bear no resemblance whatever to the language spoken by the Yakkas of East Nipal. A similarity may indeed be traced here and there between a Wedda word and the equivalent for the same idea in modern Tamil, Malayalam, or Telegu, but the cases in which comparison is possible are so rare that these apparent coincidences may be fairly considered to be merely fortuitous. The signs of a grammatical structure are too faint to justify any inferences of comparative philological value, and upon an examination of those words which may be said to constitute the most fundamental and necessary portion of a language, no special conclusion is to be drawn. But an analysis or consideration of the Wedda language may be more fitly postponed than dealt with at present, especially as the value of linguistic evidence is but slight in the determination of ethnological questions. Attention may, however, be drawn to the circumstance which has been pointed out by Mr. Tylor,¹ and which invests the subject with peculiar interest, that the Weddas are the only savage race in existence speaking an Aryan language, for such it undoubtedly is, although the people can in no sense be classified ethnologically as Aryans themselves.

BERTRAM F. HARTSHORNE.

(1) *Journal of the Ethnological Society*, April, 1870.

ON EXAMINATIONS.

TWENTY years ago, the system of examinations had, perhaps, reached the acme of its popularity. Several of the most distinguished men in parliament, at the bar, in the church, in literature, in almost every walk of public life, were pointed to as examples of its success, and of the power of discrimination possessed by those who administered it. Senior wranglers were on the 'bench'; First-classmen constituted a large proportion of the cabinet; the most eminent scholars and writers were, to a large extent, the same with those who had attained the highest places in the examinations of the universities. Hence, not unnaturally, it was thought that a system which had produced such results, and had been worked, as it confessedly had been worked, with so much impartiality and judgment, might be extended and elaborated to the great advantage both of learning and of the public service. It was about this time, that the old system of nomination was abolished in the Indian Civil Service, and it was determined that the future administrators of India should be appointed according to the results of a competitive examination. A similar arrangement, with some important modifications, was soon afterwards extended to the government offices at home. About the same time, the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were being re-organized by Parliamentary Commissions, and, in Oxford, at least, the examination system acquired additional importance by being applied with far more stringency than previously to the elections for fellowships. Many students, who would formerly have been content with the ordinary degree, were also encouraged to read for honours by the institution of new class-lists or triposes.

Most persons who are competent to form an opinion, seem to be agreed that the public services, both at home and in India, have gained by the substitution, wholly or partially, of a system¹ of

(1) "Until the year 1855 admission into the Civil Service was purely a matter of patronage. No examination, either test or competitive, was required. A candidate was appointed because he was the younger son of a peer, or the son of one who had been useful in electioneering matters; whilst the inferior appointments—such as the Customs, Excise, and Revenue departments—were the perquisites of respectable butlers and footmen of the nobility. In fact, the Civil Service was regarded by that influential minority, the 'Upper Ten Thousand,' as a comfortable house of refuge, supported by the nation for their poor relations or dependents. The result can easily be imagined; the condition of the home service was as unsatisfactory as possible. Complaints daily arose of the inefficiency of the officials. Men high up in office were often found incapable of writing a letter without grammatical and orthographical mistakes. The time of the public was wasted, and their patience exhausted by useless red tape machinery. Heads of offices came late and went away early, and their example was followed by the junior clerks. A government office was regarded by the public mind as a place in

examination for the old system of nomination. There are probably, also, not many persons conversant with the University of Oxford,¹ during the last five-and-twenty or thirty years, who would deny that, taking the colleges in the aggregate, and speaking generally, the quality of the common-rooms, and the efficiency of the educational staff have been improved by the substitution of the present system of election for the varied, and often not wholly unselfish, considerations which used at one time to determine the choice of the electors. Speaking plainly, purity of election has, in the case of the Oxford Fellowships, been, at least, one result of the application of the examination system, and this is a result which no one acquainted with the previous condition of Oxford ought to underestimate.

It cannot be denied, however, that the extension and consequent elaboration of examinations has led, incidentally, to many grave evils, and all who are interested in education and learning ought to be grateful to writers, like Mr. Pattison and Mr. Sayce, who have unsparingly exposed these evils, even though they may have exaggerated their intensity, or failed to recognise what others will regard as counterbalancing advantages. Thus, there can be no doubt that examinations hamper the freedom of the teacher; in order to secure the attention of his pupils, he must lecture on such subjects, and in such a manner, as will be remunerative in the examinations. Again, they often prevent the pupil from following his natural bent, or induce a mechanical style of reading which is injurious to his highest intellectual development. And, though, at first sight, it might appear as if the examination system would, at all events, promote thoroughness, it unfortunately has too frequently the opposite effect of encouraging superficiality; it does not "pay" to pursue a subject beyond a certain point. General views and minute facts alike admit of being "crammed." Examiners, after all, being but fallible men, the show of knowledge is often mistaken for the reality. Style often counts for more than matter, cleverness for more than depth, a vague acquaintance with many subjects for more than a scientific knowledge of one.

So great are these evils, that if all students were inspired by an ardent love of knowledge, and all who nominate to offices were actuated by a simple desire to find the best man, and had also ample opportunities of discovering him, we might well be content to

which the officials read the papers, wrote private letters at her Majesty's expense, and attended to everything but what they were paid for—their business."—Ewald's "Guide to the Civil Service," pp. 1, 2.

(1) In the University of Cambridge Fellowships had been awarded by examination long before this became the rule in the University of Oxford. At Trinity they were awarded mainly by the results of an examination conducted by the college itself; at other colleges by the results of the University Triposes.

see the abolition of the examination system. We might say emphatically and truly that it has been tried, and found wanting. But, as we are not living in an ideal world, but one in which exertion is constantly requiring stimulus, and faults and abuses are constantly crying for remedies, it may be worth while to ask what would be the consequences if the stimulus and protection of examinations were suddenly withdrawn. Should we be content to see the old system of nomination re-introduced into all branches of the public service? Should we be content to see the fellowships in our colleges filled up according to their pleasure by small and irresponsible bodies, without the possibility of any appeal to public opinion? Should we be content to see the great mass of youths who throng our universities and public schools, subject to no restraint but the obligation to attend lectures, or left absolutely to select their own subjects and method of study, and, in fact, to determine for themselves whether they would study at all or not? To the two first of these questions, it may, of course, be replied that we may trust men to select the best servants or the best colleagues, as the case may be. But have they, when unchecked, done so in time past, and is there any reason to suppose that they are more likely to do so in the time to come? Nor is it easy to see how an obscure youth, without interest or connections, is, under ordinary circumstances, to make himself known to the dispensers of patronage by any other means than success in a competitive examination. To the last of these questions, it will probably be replied that the young men whom I have mainly in view, as requiring the stimulus of an examination, ought not to frequent the universities at all; that the universities ought to be confined to genuine students, who come for no other object than the pursuit of some branch of literature or science. This is an ideal which, perhaps, might be desirable; but there can be no question that in a practical country, like ours, the universities will always be expected to provide a liberal education, not for specialists only and future professors, but for future clergymen, schoolmasters, lawyers, statesmen, and, generally, for men who are to take a part in the affairs of life. Here we have a consideration which, as it appears to me, many of our more recent academical reformers have left altogether out of their calculation, but which they must undoubtedly take account of, if their schemes are to find any acceptance with those who will have the power of giving effect to them. Our universities ought, undoubtedly, to be "Solomon's houses," places where knowledge is being not only assimilated but advanced; but they must, whether they will it or not, continue to be places of general education as well, providing their "due supply" of men serviceable "in Church and State." Now for the average class of students, it seems to me that some kind of examination (for the old "disputations," while they

remained a reality, were only another form of examination) is indispensable, both as a guide to the subjects of study, and as a stimulus to their pursuit.

While, therefore, sharing to a considerable extent in the views of those who see great evils in the present system of examinations, I cannot go to the length of proposing its abolition. I prefer asking whether there are no remedies which may at least alleviate, if they cannot altogether remove, the disadvantages which appear to be incident to it. The suggestions which I am about to throw out are the result of some experience in the work of examining both in Oxford and elsewhere; but I propose them rather tentatively than with any confidence that I have solved the difficulties of what is perhaps the most difficult question in the whole theory of intellectual education.

I. I would suggest then that, at present, we apply the test of examinations both at too early and at too late an age. The new system of awarding scholarships at schools by competitive examination, though it undoubtedly has some advantages, has acted in the way of putting an undue strain on the mental faculties of boys at too early an age. Parents, who value the distinction, or to whom the pecuniary assistance is of great moment, are compelled to subject their sons to an elaborate and often costly education commencing almost in infancy. The result can hardly fail to be to repress the spontaneity and freshness which, if not developed in early years, are seldom developed at all, and (a most serious moral consideration) prematurely and often most unduly to stimulate the feelings of ambition and emulation. Boys, I believe, may compete for foundation scholarships at most of the great public schools up to the age of fourteen, but they are eligible at the age of eleven, and it is, of course, to the interest of the father that they should obtain these scholarships at the earliest opportunity; moreover, the time of preparation must commence some time before the actual competition. A boy, then, under ordinary circumstances, will be subjected at the age of eight or nine to a definite and systematic training for the purpose of competing with other boys, three or four years hence, in what is, for him, at his age, a stiff and searching examination, while he will be told by his parents that his future career in life will mainly depend upon his success. Thus, learning is associated from his earliest years with the prospect of pecuniary gain and social distinction. Can we wonder if the next generation of young Englishmen is portentously ambitious, portentously grasping, and portentously stupid? To suggest a remedy is very difficult, but it certainly occurs to one to ask if it is desirable to fill up foundation scholarships in this manner? Or, if it is desirable, might not the age of admission be raised to, say, from thirteen to fifteen? But to me, I must confess, the whole system of competitive examinations for small boys appears

to be radically vicious. The sons of poor parents have gained little, if anything, by it. A man, who is really poor, cannot afford to send his son to an expensive preparatory school, and it may be questioned whether the whole amount of money spent on the extra preparation of the candidates, successful and unsuccessful, who compete for the scholarships, does not far exceed the pecuniary value of the prizes. I am not ashamed to confess myself one of those retrograde persons who regard the institution of these scholarships, or at least the opening of them to general competition, as but a very inadequate compensation to the poorer professional and trading classes for the increased charges for day-scholars at the public schools and for the abolition or reduction to the "second grade" of so many of the smaller grammar-schools, in which their sons could previously obtain a free or very inexpensive education.

But, whatever doubt there may be as to the expediency of examining boys (or rather children) between the ages of eleven and fourteen, I think that there will be few who, on reflection, will maintain that preparation for a competitive examination is a desirable employment for young men who have attained the age of three or four-and-twenty. And yet this is the age at which, to say nothing of the examinations for Fellowships, many of the students at the universities now become candidates for honours. Just at the time when a man ought to have discovered his natural bent, and to be following it, he is fettered by the inexorable requirements of an examination. If he has made up his mind to follow some practical profession, it would be far better that he should already have embarked in it; for "art is long, and life is short," and the gifts which lead to practical success and efficiency are not easily or speedily acquired. But if, on the other hand, he is really interested in some branch of study, and prepared to devote the whole or a large portion of his time to it, what he requires above all things is freedom; freedom to select this or that particular department of the subject for special investigation, freedom in his method of inquiry, freedom in arriving at his results. Advice and instruction, indeed, he may still require, and this is precisely what to a student of this age an university ought to afford; but dictation as to the subjects of study and the mode of studying he does not want, though it is just this kind of dictation to which, if he is preparing for a competitive examination, he must inevitably submit. Dictation, or peremptory guidance, of this kind is, I believe, often invaluable to the younger student: it compels him to follow a course of study, very useful or even indispensable to him, which he would find too irksome to follow of his own accord; it often introduces him to new subjects, and excites dormant interests; lastly, with its sanctions of distinction and reward, it supplies an incentive to serious study

which few well-to-do English youths of nineteen or twenty, with their multitudinous opportunities of enjoyment, could well dispense with. I arrive, therefore, at the conclusion that, while competitive examinations, if not a necessary, are at least a desirable adjunct of education, the age of preparation for them is at present extended beyond due limits, with an over-increasing tendency, be it added, to still further extension. It ought, I think, to cease at about the age of one-and-twenty. Now this is merely a matter of legislation for the schools and the universities. Boys should leave school at eighteen (they now frequently do not leave till twenty), and the university course for the Bachelor's degree should, in all cases, be limited to three years.¹ Besides having the effect of cutting short the period of preparation for examinations, and thus limiting them to what I conceive to be their proper objects, this change would be attended with many other advantages. It would enable the ordinary student to enter earlier on his professional career. It would enable the professed student to devote himself at an earlier age to the free and unrestricted pursuit of his special study. By liberating this latter class from the control of the examinations, it would probably vastly increase the matured study, the genuine spirit of research, and the true scientific interest which even the most favourable critics of the universities now deplore as so largely wanting. Moreover, a change such as I have suggested would go a long way towards solving the question of discipline, which, for many years past, has been the torment of college tutors. If the undergraduate came up at an earlier age, and took his degree in a shorter time, than at present, the university and colleges might insist on a far more stringent system of discipline than now, when there is so large an infusion of men of mature age to whom it is almost impossible to apply any strict system of rules, and whose exemption almost necessarily leads to the exemption of others. A distinct line of demarcation might be drawn between the young undergraduate, who was reading for his degree, and who would be subject to definite disciplinary rules, and the bachelor who was remaining in the university for the purposes of special study, and would simply be expected to conduct himself as a respectable citizen conducts himself elsewhere. In fact, the termination of the legal nonage would as nearly as possible coincide with the termination of the academical

(1) These remarks refer mainly to the University of Oxford. At both universities, the average duration of the course for a Pass Degree is a good deal shorter than that for honours. At Cambridge, the honours' course does not exceed three and a quarter, or three and a half years; but I believe that the undergraduates, at least those who are likely to be candidates for mathematical honours, go up at rather a later age than at Oxford. In Oxford, the limit of standing for honours (and the candidate almost always avails himself of his last chance) is, by a recent regulation, the sixteenth term (the end of the fourth year), but by taking an honour in some other subject, even though it be only a fourth class, the candidate can defer his principal examination to his twentieth term (the end of the fifth year).

nonage, and in this way, I think, many minor difficulties of college and university government would be solved.

It will be observed that, though I propose that the B.A. degree should be taken at an earlier age than at present, I contemplate the probability of a considerable number of graduates continuing their studies in the universities. These would form the advanced classes of the professors, and would, it is to be hoped, set an example of diligent and earnest intellectual effort to the younger students.

One undoubted advantage which would result from the Bachelor's degree being commonly taken at an earlier age than at present, would be that less value would be attached, than is now the case, to the class-lists and triposes. The desire to gain academical distinction is now often far too absorbing, and often completely overpowers the more generous desire to gain knowledge and intellectual aptitude. Hence, one of the causes why it has come to be thought that the main, if not the sole, function of a teacher in Oxford is to prepare his pupils for examination. These considerations, however, lead me to my second remedy.

II. The honours awarded on the result of a competitive examination, should not be too nicely differentiated. The attempt at an absolute arrangement by merit in the Cambridge triposes, and even the four classes of the Oxford class-lists, appear to me to offer too powerful an incentive to youthful ambition. The prospect of the first place or the first-class must often tempt a man to read far beyond his strength, and, any way, tends to concentrate his attention far too exclusively on the subjects of his examination. The student, I hold (and this I believe to be a most important point in the discussion of the present question), should always have a portion of his time free for intellectual occupations which are not covered by the examinations for which he is preparing; otherwise he is apt to acquire a slavish and mechanical habit of study, always reading with an end in view, and never for the pleasure of the occupation. Now a tripos or class-list with two classes, within which the candidates were arranged alphabetically, might, I think, furnish the requisite stimulus to industry without unduly straining the student's powers or too exclusively occupying his attention. This curtailment of the glories of the class-list might also have the advantage of diminishing the competition amongst colleges, of which I shall have to speak presently. Of course, the evils of competition would not be wholly removed by the plan which I suggest, but they would undoubtedly be considerably diminished. And if it be objected that they would re-appear in the competition for fellowships and university scholarships, I reply in the first place, that this is not likely to affect nearly so large a number of men; and, in the second place, that the nature of examinations for these prizes does not nearly to the same extent as that for the schools, control

the reading of the students. Moreover, under any future scheme of university reform, the fellowships awarded by competitive examination are likely to be much fewer than at present. I may suggest also as well worth the consideration of colleges generally a plan which has been found to work well at Trinity College, Cambridge, that of requiring or encouraging candidates for fellowships to send in Dissertations representing research or original work. The Dissertations would, of course, be only complementary to the examination; but they would furnish a very useful correction of the cram, superficiality, and mere cleverness, which examinations unless most carefully conducted, are always in danger of encouraging.

III. Every examiner should, if possible, see the whole work of the candidates, and the various examiners should have an opportunity of comparing their results and impressions. This rule, frequently as it is neglected, seems almost essential to forming an equitable estimate of the candidate's capacities and acquirements. It is not necessary that each examiner should pay the same amount of attention to each department of the work, but he ought to be acquainted with its general quality and its principal excellences and defects. When the object of the examination is the selection of persons for the purpose of performing specific duties, this rule becomes doubly important. Yet in the examinations for the public service, where this is the one object in view, it is systematically, though perhaps unavoidably, contravened. It might, however, deserve consideration, whether, even at the risk of sacrificing some of the subjects and options in these examinations, this rule, or some modification of it, might not be introduced. Probably no college in Oxford or Cambridge would consent to elect a Fellow simply by adding up marks contributed by different examiners, without requiring any conference as to his general attainments and qualifications, and it is difficult to suppose that the efficiency of the public service does not suffer by the present system. Even in Oxford, the increasing tendency of the examiners to divide the work amongst them, instead of holding themselves severally responsible for it all, though due, no doubt, to the increasing number of candidates, has probably had an unfavourable influence both on the character of the questions and on the results of the examinations.

IV. It hardly needs to be remarked that the reading and thought of the student must necessarily be affected to a great extent by the character of the questions ordinarily set in the examinations for which he is preparing, and still this is a consideration which examiners, in framing their questions, appear to be very apt to overlook. A student reading a book in which he is about to be examined, is apt to read it exclusively with a view to the questions likely to be set, and this, perhaps, is one of the greatest evils resulting from the examination system. Now, if the questions are very

vague or wide, he naturally reads his book very superficially; in fact, it is hardly necessary that he should read it at all, and for examination purposes, the notes of his tutor's lectures may be more than an equivalent for any amount of patient study on his own part. On the other hand, if the questions are exceedingly minute, or, as sometimes happens, turn on curious and recondite points which might easily escape the notice of even a patient reader, the student has to "get up" his book in a slavish and repulsive fashion, which is very likely to deaden his interest in that particular subject, if not in science and literature generally. And here again, he is not unlikely to substitute for his own reading (and little can we blame him for doing so!) the services of a "coach," who is acquainted, in undergraduate language, with the "tips." Hence, the great importance of selecting questions which will at once serve the purpose of pointing out to the student the proper method of reading a book and of insuring that he does read it. Questions of an intermediate kind between the most general and the most minute are usually the best for this purpose, and when a book has become so trite that it is difficult to find new questions of this character, it is better either to set the old questions over again, or to change the book, rather than to change the mode of examination. What I have said of examination in books applies, of course, *mutatis mutandis*, to examination in subjects.

V. Not the least difficulty connected with examinations consists in finding the right examiner. The ideal arrangement would seem to be that the teacher, if he is a good one, should examine his own pupils. In this way, the examinations would be subordinated to the teaching, as they ought to be, and not the teaching, as is too often the case, to the examinations. In schools and small universities, this arrangement may approximately be carried out, but in the competitive examinations for the Civil Service and in our large English universities it is out of the question. Whether the arrangement which now practically exists in our universities, according to which a small number of the teachers examine their own pupils and those of all the others, is a desirable, or, at least, the most desirable arrangement, admits, I think, of much doubt. When a large part of the examination consists of question-papers, and especially when some of them are on subjects as distinguished from books, I own I cannot see how the pupil can fail to derive some advantage from having his tutor on the board of examiners. Of conscious, or even unconscious, partiality no one would dream of accusing an Oxford or Cambridge examiner, but the pupil is at all times sufficiently acquainted with his tutor's idiosyncrasies, and, when his tutor is also his examiner, he can hardly be expected to refrain from studying these idiosyncrasies with special interest and attention, and considering how they are likely to reflect themselves in the papers of questions. Nor can

an examiner, even if he is perfectly just towards opinions and methods of teaching different from his own, prevent others from entertaining the contrary expectation. Hence, the somewhat unbecoming anxiety with which nominations to the examinerships are watched in Oxford both by tutors and undergraduates. It is not easy to suggest a remedy for this evil, for, outside the circle of teachers, it would generally be difficult to find persons at once sufficiently acquainted with the work and sufficiently interested in the welfare of the universities to take upon themselves what is always a very onerous, and often a very thankless office. It might, however, be an improvement on the present system of appointment, if there were a larger infusion of examiners not directly engaged in the teaching, whenever the services of competent persons of this class could be secured; and, perhaps, it might be worth trying whether the appointment of examiners from time to time, instead of for periods of office as at present, and the withholding as long as practicable of their names from those interested in knowing them, might not have the effect of making the preparation of the candidates less dependent on the character and views, known or supposed, of those who were to estimate their merits. This, it may be remarked, is already the plan adopted in the nomination of examiners for the Civil Service. But many are of opinion that there is no real remedy for this and other evils connected with the Oxford examinations, but the excision from them of disputable matter, in other words, of recent philosophy. In some respects, this would undoubtedly be a great loss, and yet it must be confessed that this element has intruded unduly on the older subjects of examination and brought with it many unforeseen consequences from which we would gladly free ourselves. Much that Mr. Pattison has said on this subject both in his work on "Academical Organization," and in his recent Article in "Mind," appears to me exaggerated, but at the same time I cannot but feel that there is an ugly truth at the bottom of it. The examinations in Oxford dominate the teaching, and it would certainly be difficult to defend the teaching, at all points, from the charges of superficiality and sophistry. A healthier tone, it seems to me, might be restored by reducing the examinations, as I have suggested at the beginning of this article, to humbler proportions. An examination designed for students of one-and-twenty after three years' residence, and offering only two classes in honours, would necessarily present a less ambitious programme than the one which Mr. Pattison has recently criticised. This would be a measure of relief both to tutors and pupils, and would result, I believe, not in less work being done than at present, but in the work done being sounder, freer, more thorough, and more lasting.

I have left myself but little space for considering the effects of the examination system upon the teachers, and in the few remarks which

I am about to make, I must, consequently, confine myself to Oxford. It is undoubtedly true, as we are now frequently told, that the Oxford tutor has become the slave of the examinations, that he has little time for his own studies, and, as a natural result, that his intellectual stock of facts and ideas is often (though to this there are many conspicuous exceptions) not much greater than that which he imparts to his pupils. He has long ceased to enjoy the *otium cum dignitate*, which was the good fortune of his predecessors, and which is still popularly associated with his position. But how has this change come about, for it has not yet, I believe, taken place at Cambridge, where the examinations are, perhaps, a more absorbing element in university life than even in Oxford? It is due to a concurrence of several circumstances which it would be tedious and beyond my present purpose to enumerate; but chief among these, doubtless, are the zeal and sense of duty which, in recent times, have inspired successive generations of tutors, impelling them to sacrifice their time, and, in many cases, their prospects to the interests of their pupils. The college tutor, in fact, some years ago, voluntarily super-added the functions of the private tutor to his own. This may have been a mistaken course, and mistaken in the tutor's own interests it undoubtedly was, but at least it demands sympathy and admiration, even though, in some respects, the consequences may have been of doubtful service to learning and education. The tradition, however, having once been created, cannot be suddenly changed. The college tutor cannot now bid the undergraduates betake themselves to private tutors, and say that his time is too valuable to spend upon preparing them for examinations. But still he need not despair of relief, though the relief may be distant, and though, perhaps, it may entail many unexpected changes in the present system of instruction. The fact is that the individual attention paid to undergraduates reading for honours is often far in excess of what is really good for them, and is due to unhealthy conditions of university life which, it is to be hoped, are not permanent. It is due partly to the present examination system, which demands knowledge, or rather a show of knowledge, greatly in excess of what the student can reasonably be expected to gain from books and his own study; but it is due, I conceive, in a far greater degree, to the unwholesome and pernicious competition which exists amongst colleges. This competition compels the tutor to look not to the intellectual improvement of his pupil, but to his chances of a class. Success in the class-list has come to be the one test of a tutor's efficiency and the one end of his exertions. A "good college" is, in popular estimation, a college which turns out a number of first-classmen, without any regard, by the way, to the advantage which it may originally have had in the material supplied to it by the schools. Now this state of things will last, and must, I think, last, while the higher teaching is mainly in

the hands of the colleges as distinguished from the university. Transfer the teaching of the higher classes of undergraduates from college to university officers, as proposed by Professor Bonamy Price in his lately published pamphlet, and, under a somewhat different form, by myself and others in evidence given before the Committee of the House of Commons on Mr. Ewart's Bill, and again before the more recent Scientific Commission, and I believe that it will at once be emancipated from its present servile subjection to the examination schools; that, while the students gain in manliness and self-reliance, the teachers will obtain more leisure for their own pursuits, and be able to place before themselves and their pupils nobler aims, and a more exalted standard of knowledge than is possible under the present circumstances of keen and incessant competition. The distinctions of the class-lists, under such a system, might possibly come to be less prized; but knowledge and true education would undoubtedly be advanced by it.

Let the forthcoming Commission address itself to two problems, the absorption, at least for the purposes of the higher teaching, in one great university of the five-and-twenty small universities which now exist in Oxford, and the provision of a career for the teachers, which shall enable them to regard Oxford as their permanent home; and I doubt not that it will create an asylum for education, literature, and science, of which the nation, in future years, will have no occasion to be ashamed. When the preponderating motive in the mind of the teacher is, and, from the nature of the circumstances must be, the success of his pupils in the class-list, or, as the phrase sometimes runs, "getting classes for the college," we can hardly expect much enthusiasm for learning, or any very exalted ideal of education. Again, it is idle to expect bricks without straw, and a profession which holds out no reasonable prospect of an opportunity of settling in life is not likely to be attractive, especially in a country like England, where the prizes of other professions (including that of the directly competing profession of the schoolmaster) are so large and so numerous. Considerable as are the corporate revenues of the universities and colleges, there are hardly a dozen places in either university which offer a decent competence to the teacher, unless coupled with the restriction of celibacy (the headships, of course, I exclude, as not directly connected with the teaching). Hence that uneasiness about the future, and that constant hankering after some other profession, which are so notable among the younger residents, and which must necessarily be so unsettling as to render almost impossible a life really devoted to study and learning. A man, who is always thinking of quitting his house, naturally does not take much pains to improve it. About the diagnosis, at least, there can be no doubt. Nor can there, I take it, be much doubt amongst impartial observers as to the nature of the required remedies.

T. FOWLER.

A NATIONAL TRAINING TO ARMS.

THE question of the maintenance of our land forces in a condition of efficiency, while adhering to our proud national principle of voluntary enlistment for the regular army, is one which appears to me to have become now, the most pressing that Parliament has to deal with.

If a sudden war takes us almost unprepared, as it would do within the next four years, from the want of efficient reserves, though we should eventually come out of it victorious, yet we should do so crippled with a doubled debt, after the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of lives, and all those reforms that we are looking forward to, would then be necessarily postponed for thirty years. If, on the contrary, we are found fully prepared in the political crisis which is fast approaching, no one will venture to assail us; our legitimate interests will be respected. We may stave war off for a whole generation,—nay we may postpone it altogether as far as England is concerned. An instant preparedness, therefore, is not only our best policy of insurance; it is a sacred duty that we owe to ourselves and to the world, in the interests of the general peace.

The recent so-called mobilisation of the army comes most opportunely at this moment to enable us to take stock of our means of offence and defence. As a means of bringing home to every mind in the nation our present lamentable weakness and the knowledge of what we want to complete our power, it will do a great national service at this juncture, and we must hail its promulgation accordingly. If it proclaims the fact that we are about 65,000 men short of the war establishment of the Infantry of the Line and the Militia taken together; and that we can barely muster 342 out of the 720 field-guns represented as necessary for our eight Army Corps, it cannot be too strongly or repeatedly impressed on the national understanding. And the country owes Sir Charles Ellice, the Quartermaster-General, its grateful thanks.

I have said that the main gain of the mobilisation scheme is to teach us how *little* we have, still more how very much we have *not* got. Thence an easy inductive step is, how are we to supply the great and acknowledged deficiencies?

Let us apply ourselves to the examination of the figures of our available Army in detail. When we come to test our power for offensive foreign war (and all effective defence of our scattered empire necessarily involves war abroad on some part of the field), the mournful fact is not to be disguised, that we are very little more than half as strong as in justice to ourselves we ought to be.

The recent changes in our army organization, though they have made us infinitely stronger than ever we were before, as I propose to show by a few simple figures farther on, have not produced results in any sort of way proportionate, even for our limited policy, to the gigantic strides made in the same time by other Powers. We have perhaps doubled our former fighting power, as it stood twenty years ago. They have quadrupled and quintupled theirs, nay, multiplied it by ten in some cases.

Let us compare then, our present effective force, with that we had at the breaking out of the Crimean War in February, 1854. It was then with great difficulty, and only after six months' delay, that we could put 30 battalions, or some 27,150 infantry; 3,000 cavalry; and 92 field-guns, into the field. I maintain that we could now, from the forces in Great Britain alone, and without drawing upon India or the colonies for a man, put into first line, at about forty-two days' notice, about 50,000 good infantry, 4,600 excellent cavalry, and 252 field-guns, right well equipped. The artillery, moreover, could be reinforced at another month's notice, to buy the extra horses, up to 342 guns, or rather more than 6 guns to every thousand men. No foreign army has more than $3\frac{1}{2}$ to the thousand. The guns and equipment for 36 more batteries, or 216 guns, stand ready in Woolwich Arsenal. The Depot brigade and the Army and Militia Reserve would give the men. And this force sent abroad would still leave us about 20,000 more fair infantry at home, to supply the casualties of the field as they arose; and this is still irrespective of some 8 to 10,000 more old soldiers, discharged ten-years' men, whom we could without difficulty raise by special war bounties in a few weeks. And 342 guns sent abroad would still leave 126 field-guns, or 21 skeleton field-batteries, at home.

To have accomplished so much in four years, for this improvement in strength dates almost entirely from Mr. Cardwell's reforms of 1870-71, reflects the highest credit on the war-minister, who then, for the first time, introduced the principles of a methodical and symmetrical organization into our hitherto chaotic system. Moreover, we had in 1854 only 44 battalions at home; we have now 77, of which 50 could, as I have said, be put at once into first line; we had, as late as 1870, only 180 effective field-guns; we have now 342, of which at least 252, or 42 batteries, could be put into first line with six weeks' warning, and the rest, or 90 more, a month later. We had in 1854 no Reserves whatsoever, we have now some 36,000. These great results speak for themselves. When the bitterness and excitement caused by the abolition of purchase have died away, and men come to judge the past fairly, history will do justice to the statesman whose sole conception and work these great and solid improvements have been.

But when, on the other hand, we come to look at the composition of the 50 battalions we should be able to send into the field, the result is anything but satisfactory.

Let us look at it a little in detail. The 50 first battalions for service on their present, or peace, strength could barely furnish between them 25,000 effective rank and file, including 3 battalions of Guards, but deducting casualties. Their war strength is 50,000 men, consequently the balance, or 25,000 men, would have to be drawn from the three following sources. First, partly from the 23 line battalions left at home (which, as they would themselves be wanted shortly after, it would not be wise to weaken too much); second, from the Army Reserve and the depots; and third, from the Militia Reserve.

Let us see what each supply would afford. Leaving out of sight the 3 battalions of Guards, which would form as a brigade a part of the expeditionary force, and which would be easily brought up to 1,000 rank and file each from the 4 other battalions of the brigade remaining at home, we now deal with the 47 line battalions which stand first on the list for foreign service.

		Rank and File.
The first 4 only of these now stand at		$820 \times 4 = 3,280$
The next 11 at		$600 \times 11 = 6,600$
The next 32 at		$520 \times 32 = 14,640$
Nominal strength of 47 battalions.		Total 26,520

This is their nominal or supposed strength: but we must count upon, at least, one-fifth, or 20 per cent. being unfit for service, as either too old, and waiting for pension, or too young for the hardships of the field, or sick in hospitals and in prisons. Making this moderate deduction, therefore, our 47 battalions would number but 21,216 men fit for the field. Now for the means of reinforcing them. It is obviously desirable at the beginning of a war to start with as many thoroughly trained soldiers as possible. The first step, therefore, would be to draw upon the 23 line battalions remaining at home. These stand at a strength of 520 rank and file each. The utmost number, therefore, that could be safely taken from each, so as to leave them fit eventually to take the field themselves, would be 200 men. This even is straining the drain beyond prudence, though necessity would compel it. From the 23 home battalions, $200 \times 23 = 46,000$ men. The Army Reserve, begun in 1867, but into which, be it observed, no men of those enlisted for six years' service since 1870 under Mr. Cardwell's scheme have yet passed, muster on paper, 7,900 men; all trained soldiers. Doubts have been expressed of the existence of this Reserve. I think these doubts are not well founded. All that can be said is, that with the small exception of only 5·8 per cent. of them, the whole number have regularly appeared for payment quarterly

for the last four years. However, I will count upon only 5,000 men from this source, because many of the 7,900, though good for garrison work, are, as I saw last year, much too old for the field.

Thus far we have counted upon only good and thoroughly trained soldiers. But we have as yet gathered only 30,816 of the 47,000 wanting to complete our line field force. From this moment the remaining sources we have to draw upon are not nearly so satisfactory. The 34 brigade depôts already formed, and 37 depôts attached to regiments, have a nominal strength of 7,992. We might safely draw from this source 3,000 men.

Now, there remains only the Militia Reserve to draw upon. These number nominally 28,900 men. That number, fully, has been present at the last three annual trainings; it amounted in 1871 to 31,000 present. But probably 3,600 of these (the War Office returns do not show the exact number) belong to the Militia *Artillery* Reserve, therefore would be required to reinforce their own arm of the service; deducting 10 per cent. of the remainder, a very modest estimate, as unfit for immediate service, we get about 21,960 men to fill up the line. Of these, 13,184 would go to the 47 field battalions. The rest would join the 23 battalions remaining at home, and whom we have just depleted of 4,600 soldiers, and which they would bring up to nearly their full strength of 1,000 rank and file each. To recapitulate, our 47 field line battalions would be made up to war strength as follows:—

Composition.	Nominal Strength.	Unfit and Casualties.	Effective.
47 line battalions first for service .	26,520	5,304	21,216
From the 23 battalions remaining } at home	11,960	. . .	{ take only 4,600
Army Reserve	7,900	2,900	5,000
From the depôts	7,992	. . .	3,000
Militia Reserve (infantry) . . .	24,400	2,440	13,184 ¹
Total effective of the 47 line battalions.			47,000
The three battalions of Guards			3,000
Total field infantry			50,000

But here comes the weakness of our position. Of these 47,000, about 31,000 would be thoroughly formed soldiers. The other 16,000 would be scarcely trained at all. Those who had had most military experience would have been out at say three annual militia trainings of one month each. Those few who had joined the Militia Reserve since 1874 would have been out for twelve weeks' drill, and in so far, better than the others.

(1) The other 8,776 would go to fill up the twenty-three weakened home battalions.

But the great weakness of our present transition state, terrible for a soldier to contemplate, who knows how the regimental *esprit de corps* is the backbone of our army, is that in addition to nearly one-third not being soldiers at all, *almost three-fifths of the whole Field army would be men who would be entirely new to their regiments, new to their companies, new to their officers; and who had never seen their comrades in their lives before, till within perhaps six weeks of going into the field, where they might have to oppose men who—under any one of the foreign systems—were all serving beside comrades and under officers whom they had known and worked with for years.* I wish to speak with all moderation, and without exaggeration. But this is emphatically not the composition of an army such as England, in justice to the ancient renown of her soldiers, in common fairness to the generals who were to lead them, against numerical odds perhaps of three to one, ought to put into the field to sustain her honour. The men from the Militia Reserve are, I have no doubt, equal to the average of their countrymen both in spirit and in physique. But they simply are not soldiers. They have learnt the use of their arms; those regiments which I have myself had to inspect have manœuvred very fairly well; they have done wonders in fact, considering their short training. But they have not learnt the habits of discipline; the instinct of the soldier, the mutual reliance and confidence in their comrades and their officers, which makes a man ready to do and dare anything, and which it takes at least two years, and perhaps three, to instil into an Englishman. And, be it remarked, every battalion and every company of the whole field force, with the exception of the three battalions of Guards, and the four first line battalions, who stand at 820 men, would be composed, in half, if not in three-fifths of its whole strength, of these untrained and new men—soldiers only in name.

If it be asked, what has caused this? How is it we have not larger trained Reserves? I can only reply that the one unaccountable oversight of Lord Cardwell's organization appears to be that in the beginning of 1872, after a system of short service had been decided upon, which, at six years' service in the ranks and six in the Reserve would, if the army had been kept at full strength, have given us in the year 1882—83 a maximum Reserve of trained soldiers of 75,000 to 80,000 men, it was unaccountably overlooked that to produce this Reserve the line battalions must be kept for four or five years at an increased figure.

The attainment of this Reserve in the given time depended wholly on two conditions:—

First. The enlistment for six years of from 30,000 to 32,000 recruits annually.

Second. The passing into the Reserve of a consequent and cor-

responding flow of from 20,000 to 22,000 men annually. This required a temporary increase of the Establishment; in place of which, however, the inexplicable oversight was committed of reducing the Establishment, between 1st January, 1872, and the end of 1873, by more than 8,000 men, principally in the line infantry: consequently, instead of some 32,000 recruits being required annually, on which calculation the future force of the Reserve was based, only 18,000 to 20,000 have been enlisted; and the number of men to pass into the Reserve in the corresponding years has been of course proportionately reduced.

TABLE OF MEN ENLISTED IN EACH YEAR, AND OF THE NUMBER THAT WILL PASS INTO THE RESERVE IN THE CORRESPONDING YEAR, SIX YEARS LATER.

Number enlisted for Short Service in each year.		Of these there are now still serving (in April, 1876).	Number who will pass into the Reserve in each year.	
Year.	Number of Men.		Number.	In the year.
1870	2,402	1,347	1,411	1876
1871	9,145	6,230	5,234	1877
1872	10,261	7,675	5,970	1878
1873	9,854	7,744	5,560	1879
Total .		17,196	18,175	
The War Office Return does not go beyond 1873, but has been continued, approximately, from other sources, as below :				
Year.	Number of Men.			
1874	12,856	..	About 7,480	1880
1875	{ About 13,924 }	..	7,854	1881
1876	{ Say the same } 13,924	..	7,854	1882—3
			Total Men.	In the year.
The Reserve will consequently, on reaching its maximum, number a total of about			About 41,363	1883—84

A very wide and sad deficiency from the 75,000 to 80,000 which the Reserve was expected to produce by that time!

Also, in consequence of very few men having enlisted for short service in 1870-71, when the idea had not yet firmly taken root, next year, 1876, only 1,460 men will pass into the Reserve; and it will only be in 1877 that any considerable number, and then only between 5,000 and 6,000, will go into it. The actual numbers are given on this page, from an actuarial calculation made in the War

Office, and granted to me as a return by the Secretary of State for War, on my motion of the 28th April, 1875.

The difficulty, then, that we have to deal with in the future, and the rapidly approaching future, is this :—

The Reserve which we have been looking forward to will, it is now certain, be formed far more slowly than any one ever anticipated, and will never reach the expected total. In four years hence, or the end of 1879, it will only have amounted to about 18,000 men; while the present existing Reserve of 7,900 will by that time be reduced by one-half, from the men's terms of service gradually expiring in the interim. From both sources, then, we cannot count, at the end of 1879, upon more than about 22,000 in the Reserve.

The Militia Reserve of 28,000 of very partially trained men is therefore our main, if not our only stand-by, if war overtakes us in the interval. The sudden influx into the ranks of the field army, on the outbreak of war, of more than one-half of nearly untrained men incorporated into every battalion and company, is, as every soldier of experience will admit, enough to jeopardise the value of the whole army as a reliable fighting force.

Having examined the questions of numbers, and of military efficiency as regards training, let us now look at the much disputed point of physique of the men enlisted since 1870, on which so much was said, well and indifferently, last Session. Lord Elcho, Mr. Holms, and Colonel Mure, have not hesitated to describe them as "wretched boys," "miserable weeds," the "waifs and strays of society." The Duke of Cambridge and the Secretary of State for War, on the other hand, have always maintained that, though they are undoubtedly younger than the men we used to get twenty-five years ago, and though the larger proportion of young men, amounting to 200 or 300 in each battalion, therefore gives an appearance of feebleness to the whole, yet they are good stuff, improvable in time; and when well fed and cared for, rapidly growing into stout and efficient soldiers after from two to three years.

I have taken the greatest pains to ascertain the truth, and have had exceptional facilities for doing so.

Out of thirty years that I have had the honour to serve her Majesty, the last eighteen years have been almost continually on the general staff, in both the two great departments of the army. This has brought me in contact, daily and hourly, with almost every regiment in the service. In India, in Persia, on the Aldershot staff, in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and finally for four years in Ireland, I have been brought into constant communication with every one of the 141 battalions of the line, except thirteen.

The opinion I have arrived at, then, is that the men we have been getting since 1870 are most decidedly of considerably lower standard, both in height and physique, than those we used to get thirty years

ago, and especially at the time of the Irish famine of 1847. In 1870-1 and part of 1872, a very large influx of very inferior lads took place; mostly from the brigade depôts, and especially from certain brigade depôts in particular, which it would be invidious to particularise. Boys of 16 and 17 declaring themselves to be 18, were carelessly passed into the service without sufficient examination and supervision. In the latter half of 1872 this, however, improved most decidedly; principally because of the attention repeatedly drawn to the subject by Lords Strathnairn and Sandhurst in the House of Lords. As the brigade depôt system has gradually got into better working order (and it must be borne in mind that it is not half developed yet), selection in recruiting has been more carefully made. In 1874, and more especially in 1875, most commanding officers declare themselves satisfied with the quality of their recruits. Yet not one of them would, I am persuaded, either desire or venture to assert that there is any comparison at all in physique between these men, and those of from twenty-five to thirty years ago. They are younger, shorter, and weaker. And be it remembered that with a short-service system, such as we have entered upon since 1871, it is more than ever essential that we should *begin* with a well-developed lad not much under 20 years of age. For when we enlisted men for 21 years, it did not matter if a considerable proportion began at 16 and 17. They were lost sight of in the large preponderance of older soldiers; and as they had to serve for half a life-time, if they developed into stalwart men after five or six years' service, our object was accomplished. But now the very essence of the Reserve system is, that you should pass men rapidly into it, in considerable numbers, after three to six years. And if you get your recruit at 17, he is only 20 by the time he ought to be passing into the Reserve; and he is neither a soldier, nor even a full-grown man then.

Mr. Hardy has most wisely persevered in maintaining the brigade depôts, in spite of the ignorant clamour raised against them by those who cannot understand the immense advantages: First, of a local military connection, such as the Highland and the Irish regiments have alone maintained during the last seventy years. Second, of the grand saving of labour, time, and confusion, in event of war or invasion, in having the work of the Militia and Volunteers, and the depôts of the line, *decentralized* in the able hands of sixty-six selected Colonels, commanding at as many local centres, instead of being all thrust at once, amidst indescribable hurry and disorder, on the already overburdened Chiefs of the Auxiliary Forces at the War Office. Never was money better spent than that which shall make this system of decentralized work perfect and complete.

Having now endeavoured to give the facts of our present army condition, as accurately as possible, and without party bias,

let me sum up with a general review of the results of what has been done since 1870. This will come most suitably perhaps in the form of two questions, and their answers.

First.—Do the results of the new system, up to the present time, give us reasonable hope that it will answer the national expectation?

Second.—May we rely upon a steady flow hereafter of from 25,000 to 32,000 young men annually, on the present terms and inducements of voluntary enlistment and of fit age and physique to fill the ranks of our army, and to allow of a corresponding draught of 20,000 trained soldiers, of about 24 years of age, annually to the Reserve?

I wish I could answer the first question without any qualification whatever. I can only do so, with the following material modification: This depends entirely upon our having the necessary time of uninterrupted peace allowed to us. The Reserve system will be at its maximum in the year 1883. It will certainly not, at the present rate of progress, give us 80,000 men in that year, but only between 40,000 and 45,000. If these figures are to be exceeded it must be either by the enlistment of older men, or by drafting a considerable number of men of three years' service into the Reserve.

To the second question I answer unhesitatingly: A review of the results, till now, gives us no reasonable hope whatever that we shall be able to keep up the sufficient supply of serviceable men; especially after 1877, when 5,334 men will go to the Reserve and some 29,000 will consequently be wanted for the army.

The army at home and in the Colonies (excluding India) is now 4,000 below its proper strength, even on a reduced peace establishment. The Artillery are 1,200 short in gunners, consequently in big and powerful men. They can get as many dwarfish drivers as they please. The Guards again, tall men of large chest measurement, are 420 short; or nearly the strength of a battalion of the line, out of a small peace establishment of 5,250.¹ Though the past winter has been one of exceptional depression in the coal and iron trades, and slackness of business generally, when it might naturally be expected that, as in former similar cases, recruits would come forward briskly, the report of the Inspector-General shows a falling off of nearly 2,000 in recruits alone, as compared with last year.

What further is wanted to prove that the sufficient supply of moderately powerful men is already exhausted, even before the coming drain of the Reserve scheme has begun to tell? Does anybody suppose this state of things will improve? It is to be devoutly hoped not, for it simply means that the country is

(1) So much is the labour of big men like the Guards in demand, that I am told it is an ordinary practice for employers to pay the money to purchase their discharges, even without any guarantee that they will remain with them.

so rich and prosperous, that the labour of big men, of good constitution and decent character, can command its own, and an ever-increasing price. This is highly satisfactory to the political economist, but it is madness and distraction to the economical army reformer. And it can't improve; but must get worse. There is manifestly no elasticity in the system; no vitality, much less any steady flow of men that would give any large margin to come and go upon.

We are 4,000 below the established strength now; reduced age and reduced physique notwithstanding. We shall be many thousands short, as soon as the draught to the Reserve begins in 1877. Evidently on the first strain of war the supply of men would collapse altogether. It is better that we should acknowledge the truth now, when it may be remedied, than four or five years hence, when it may be fatally too late.

Let us look at the question of physique again, for a moment, from the point of view of the real test of armies, namely, the marching power of their infantry. It has been my lot to see something of hard marching in my time. On the 16th July, 1857, at my father's battle of Cawnpore, where he beat the Nana in the full flush of his treacherous triumph over the luckless but heroic handful who defended Wheeler's entrenchment, the test put upon our force was not so much one of fighting as of marching power.

The men who saved India that day, the eight hundred grand tough old soldiers of the 78th Highlanders, 64th and 84th regiments, and 1st Madras Fusiliers, represented 1,400 who paraded for the march that morning. Between 3 A.M. and 7 P.M. they marched that day twenty-six miles under a frightful sun, and fought hard for four hours afterwards. They had, moreover, come a hundred miles in the five previous days, with one halt to destroy Futtehpore town, always under the July sun of Central India. Moreover, to add to the immense physical strain, from causes beyond control in that rapid advance, and in spite of the utmost efforts of the Commissariat officers, most of the men had had no regular meat meal for over forty-eight hours. The meat killed for them on the 14th of July had become putrid, from the intense heat, before it could be issued. On the 15th they fought twice, and got to their halting ground at dark; and in consequence of the stoppage of the bridge over the Pandoo just behind them, most of the men were asleep, dead beat, before the hard ration of bullock-beef could be brought over and issued to them. Being left uncooked, it was spoilt again by the tremendous heat before daylight, and the men threw it away in disgust. The tinned meats and preserved rations that have saved many an over-marched soldier's life in later wars, by coming at the very nick of time, were not known in those days. They got

nothing but biscuit that night, and only a little more biscuit and some porter at the short halt before they went into action on the 16th.

A greater test of bodily endurance and toughness probably never was applied. It was lucky there was no large admixture of pretty short-service striplings there, but all big, gaunt, bearded men thirty years old and more. At the close of that memorable day, of the 16th of July, as darkness fell just as the last of the enemy's guns was wrested from them, we had not eight hundred men, all told, left in line. In spite of almost superhuman efforts, the rest had either straggled, fallen to the rear exhausted (in which case many were cut up by the rebel cavalry), were detached guarding baggage and captured guns, or were killed or wounded. We had not a single gun in line; the draught-bullocks, exhausted even more than the men, were stuck fast in a ploughed field a mile behind. At that moment the fate of British India hung in the balance. It hung on the strength and endurance—the marching power, in fact—of those eight hundred well-proved soldiers, the sturdy remains of half as many more who could not keep up. Three of the regiments were fortunately composed of men averaging twelve years' service, and seasoned, not weakened, by an average residence of about eight years in India. Those three regiments had each from 220 to 250 men in line. The fourth regiment, largely composed of recruits, of equally high spirit certainly, and who displayed repeatedly a temper and dash never surpassed in war, had barely 120 men to the front. The rest, poor lads! though they staggered on till they were nearly blind with exhaustion, nerved by the hope of saving their countrywomen and children, simply could not keep up. They had either to be left with the baggage, or dropped by the road-side. I say nothing of moral endurance or of courage; they are the natural inheritance of our whole race, mature men and fledglings alike; but I do say unhesitatingly that the "staying" power of those eight hundred tried old soldiers held India for England that day. At the decisive moment the rush with the bayonet, and that alone, did the work, and those eight hundred tough old soldiers carried all before them without a check.

But if even one-third of those 1,400 men we mustered that day had been of the average quality, age, strength, and size of more than half of each of our present Aldershot battalions, I fear much the result would have been widely different. Their hearts would have been just as big, but more than half of them would have been simply not equal to the continued physical effort of so tremendous a strain.

Let me call to mind again what I saw in France in the last week of August, 1870. The First and Second German armies united under Prince Frederick Charles were holding Bazaine locked fast up in Metz. Their Third army, under the Crown Prince of Prussia, and their Fourth army, under the Crown Prince of Saxony, both under

the immediate command of the Emperor himself, were pressing on towards Chalons, expecting to meet MacMahon at bay there. I was some miles behind their centre; for the first time in my life a peaceful spectator in war, trying to do a little for the cause of humanity by carrying the noble succours of the English Red Cross Society where they were most wanted, to the wounded of both nations alike; therefore utterly neutral, but still, as a soldier, not unobservant of the interesting moves of the great game going on around. On the evening of the 25th of August the great body of German cavalry, 120 squadrons, which had been pushed on to reconnoitre Chalons, sent back word to the Emperor's headquarters at Bar-le-duc that MacMahon had given them all the slip; that, with a start of more than four days he was hastening northwards, endeavouring, partly by railway and partly by road, to get past the Germans by Rheims, Rethel, Chéne-Populeux, and Montmedy, to the relief of Bazaine. Here came again a fair trial of sheer marching power. The French had seven clear days at their disposal to cover 105 miles in. The Germans, from pressing hitherto due west, had not only in that one night to turn all their seven corps, division by division, over an extended front of forty-five miles, into a new direction due north; but then the arduous task lay before them by marching not less than twenty-seven miles a-day for some divisions, and over twenty miles a-day for the nearer ones, to endeavour to overtake MacMahon near Stonne or Mouzon, and cut in between him and Metz.

This was to be done by sheer marching: leg-power, and that alone. Not an inch of it could be aided by rail. It was the most interesting military study I ever saw. All the world reads the story now, as it is unfolded, bit by bit, in the truthful, matter-of-fact, yet graphic pages of the seventh volume of the German Official War Narrative. We know the result: how the French failed to make more than 67 miles in seven days; how the Germans, under every disadvantage, by mere endurance, did their 25 to 27, and even 29 miles a day, cut in before the French, and not only anticipated them long before reaching Metz, but, by rapidity of movement alone, forced them to abandon Bazaine to his fate, and to turn back North to that hopeless rat-trap at Sedan. Once hemmed in there, the end was a foregone conclusion. Escape from that circle of crushing artillery fire was hopeless. There on the 1st of September the French Empire was drowned in blood, the victim of military maladministration, and of false confidence in an unsound system.

But not the loss was the immediate cause of that catastrophe the inertness and lowered marching power of their dispirited and over-weighted infantry, recruited under a system of substitution, that left it only the physical dregs of a great people, instead of the flower of its warlike strength. Let us ponder the lesson in time. Four

years hence, just about the time the Eastern pear is ripe for plucking, according to the calculation that keeps Russia wisely and warily inactive now, the moral may be studied too late.

I have quoted these instances of tests of endurance and power, because they suggest to my mind this grave consideration. Are our Infantry, as they stand at present, and as the system now existing promises to make the bulk of them four years hence, equal to the high standard we require? Are they up to the level of what our old soldiers in India did in 1857? or to the level of what the Germans did in 1870? In my judgment, which may be fallacious, but is certainly unbiassed, there is but one answer. Most decidedly and emphatically not.

Our race has in no whit deteriorated. It has notoriously improved, in every class of life. The tall, stalwart men we want are to be seen everywhere, except where they are most wanted—in the ranks of our army.

This simply means that our army system is no longer in harmony with the national development in all other respects, but has fallen behind it. To bring the two together again we must devise new means, by adapting our new social circumstances to the old, unalterable military principles. Let our army be once more recruited, under similar circumstances, to the men who conquered, despite of climate and hardship, in 1857; who were enlisted, be it recollected, in 1847-48, at the time when the distress in Ireland brought the pick of her agricultural class into the ranks. Or let them, by an improvement of our present system—by increased inducements, in fact—be drawn once more from even the middle strata instead of the very poorest, physically, of our working population, and we need not fear comparison with any army in Europe. We should be able again to march with any nation in the world. And it cannot be too often repeated, even at the risk of wearisome reiteration: henceforth, more than ever, marching power means success in war.

I feel bound to explain why I hold this unfavourable opinion of a large part of our Infantry. I took the greatest pains to get at the exact truth last year at the summer manœuvres. Besides following the movements of the troops, closely, from week to week, noting the effective of each regiment, and the numbers that “fell out,” I made it especially my business to be present at the last day’s march in on the 22nd of July, and found myself that day usefully employed in closely observing every Infantry soldier of the force at Aldershot, as they came into camp at the conclusion of the month’s manœuvres. There could not have been a better test, in peace time. The troops had lived in almost incessant wet for a fortnight; the last week but one had been so bad that they could

scarcely lie down at night. On the other hand, they had been excellently fed; had had regular hours, long rests, a splendid climate, and no protracted night-work. I watched every man of the Infantry closely as they came swinging in with an elastic step, at the end of their 22-mile march that day, in full marching order. Their appearance was admirable; the cheerfulness under discomfort, the light-heartedness and good-nature, the excellent feeling manifest between officers and men, made me, as an Englishman and a soldier, proud of the temper of that force. As a good judge said that day, "These lads would take a lot of beating." But, when I pictured to myself how these boys would have stood the hard grinding, short feeding, constant alternate drenching and roasting of the summer of 1857, during the Indian mutiny; the tedious dark night marches, and long fasts, and blazing sun, I could not but feel that it was well they were not so tested. There was no more comparison between them and the hardy veterans of 1857, than there is between a schoolboy and a full-grown navy. Nor could I think of them for one moment as equal, physically, to the hard, wiry Bavarians, or the sturdy, broad-shouldered Pomeranians and Brandenbergers whom I saw march the French down in 1870. The contrast was nothing less than painful. About a third of them had, in sporting phrase, "had enough." A little more strain, and they would have broken down.

This, then, sums up the whole case against them. For such work as the intense strain of the Indian mutiny, or the hard marching the Germans went through in the last ten days of August, 1870, one-third of our infantry, at least, would be "nowhere" in a fortnight. They may be nice growing lads, but they are emphatically not the stuff that successful campaigning armies are made of.

Let us not deceive ourselves. The stuff we have in the ranks of our infantry is fairly good; it has improved perceptibly in the last eighteen months; it is perhaps equal to the ordinary contingencies of war. But it is decidedly *not* fit to represent the English nation worthily side by side with continental armies;—it is decidedly *not* equal to any extraordinary emergency, and it is as decidedly not likely to improve under the present conditions of our service. The changes of 1870 have wrought wonders comparatively; but they will not produce the results expected of them, either now or four years hence; not because they were faulty in themselves, but because they have been since outmatched and outstripped by forces of steadily increasing intensity, telling on the recruiting question, and which will continue to tell upon it, heavier and heavier day by day, in the future. The sooner we realise this hard fact the better for the nation.

But there is yet another point of view from which the supply of

men is a more complete and deplorable failure than any other. That is, the extent to which the line and Militia starve each other by absurdly and unwisely competing for almost the same class.

To refer to the mobilization scheme, as a test of the collective numbers of both branches of the Service. The figures therein imagined stand thus:—The 8 army corps we possess, upon paper, are intended to consist of 21 battalions each, or 168 in all. Of these 64 battalions are of the line, and 104 of the Militia, which are to be brigaded together. Now the line, artillery and infantry together, are already over 4,000 short of their peace strength. The Militia, besides, is 35,464 short of its *peace* establishment, for it numbered only 88,384, rank and file, at the last training, out of a supposed strength¹—again on paper—of 123,848. But, as we have shown, the line would want the whole 28,900 of the Militia Reserve, and more, immediately on the declaration of hostilities. Consequently it stands to demonstration that the 168 field battalions of both would, immediately on the outbreak of war, be found to be, between them, about some 60,000 to 65,000 men short of their proper strength!

Where are these men, or the half of them, or even the fourth of them, to come from, at six weeks' notice, with the present inducements?

Clearly, unless the competition between the Militia and the line is stopped, the voluntary system is for the future a dead failure.

We all know that when prices are once raised they are never allowed to go down again. We cannot attempt to compete with private employers of labour, by raising the soldier's 8s. a week to either 12s. or 14s. It is out of the question.

A mere increase of 2d. a day means an addition of £365,000 to the estimates, which already reach £14,000,000. A general rise to 16s. a week, therefore, as Mr. Holms proposes, would amount to £2,689,000 more, or a gross army charge of *over sixteen millions and a half a year*.

No ministry would venture to propose this; the country would not tolerate the idea for a moment; and very rightly, because under an improved system it is unnecessary.

I have already mentioned that the greatest blot of our system is the competition for absolutely the same men between the Militia and the line.

This is apparent to all. Mr. John Holms, the able and talented member for Hackney, says, "Get rid of this competition, by doing away with the Militia." Well, that would certainly be a very simple mode of proceeding, if only it were safe. But most people

(1) See Parliamentary Paper, No. 94, of 1875. Return to the House of Lords on the motion of Lord Foxford (Earl of Limerick). Printed on the 7th May, 1875.

will, I think, prefer to say, "Tell us first what you are going to give us in place of the Militia?"

To that end let us examine what the Militia are; what they now do for us, and what they have done for us in the past. I must altogether deny that the force is the "useless toy" which Mr. Holms supposes it to be. I have had to inspect many of its regiments, especially in Ireland, and I can only say that if I had had the power of transferring those thousands of fine young fellows to the line bodily as they stood, I should be much better satisfied as to the prospects of the strength and efficiency of our army than I am at present. The Militia Reserve, especially, are almost the flower of the working class of this country. They are sturdy farm-labourers, artisans, miners, colliers, iron-workers, and such like, earning good wages all the year round, and liking the month's summer training as a holiday. 30,000 of the best of them are already under engagement to join the line in case of war. If such men prefer to come to us through the Militia, instead of by direct enlistment, it would be most unwise and inexpedient to hinder them. Then, too, what have the Militia done for the line in the past? To quote Mr. Holms's own figures, from his valuable paper read before the Brighton Social Science Congress in October last, they gave the line, during the Peninsular war 110,098 men; during the Crimean war, 71,182 men; and in the last four years they have given the line no less than 20,000 men. At Waterloo, these Militia volunteers composed one-third, if not more, of those steadfast squares which stood like rocks amidst a foaming sea, and against which the flower of the French Cuirassiers flung themselves the whole day long, repeatedly but in vain.

On the embodiment of the Militia, at the commencement of the Crimean war, nearly 20,000 Militiamen volunteered to the line *within one month*. This, then, is a solid source of supply that it would be most imprudent to meddle with destructively till we can see our way clearly to substituting something as good or more reliable in its place.

Mr. Holms argues that the Militia are no longer necessary, because the Volunteers would now entirely supply their special function and office, that of taking charge of the home garrisons and arsenals in time of war, and thus leaving our whole regular army free and available at once for operations abroad. But unfortunately, in advancing this opinion so confidently, Mr. Holms proceeds entirely upon assumption; for he asserts that regarding which neither he nor any one else has ever yet brought forward one atom of proof. In fact, all the evidence we have in the facts of several years' past experience points to an exactly opposite conclusion. We know that it is with the greatest difficulty, after every sort of cajoling and coaxing, and indirect subsidising, that any com-

manding officer of a Volunteer corps has ever been able to get much more than 150 men of his regiment together for even seven days' consecutive embodiment in camps in the autumn. There may be one or two singular exceptions to this rule. I believe Colonel Lloyd Lindsay's corps is one, but I am not aware of another. What childishness it is therefore to talk of the Volunteers ever undertaking to fill the place of the Militia for permanent embodiment in our camps and garrisons in time of war. Moreover, I directly put this question to Lord Bury, an enthusiastic Volunteer colonel, in a correspondence that took place between us in the *Times*, in December, 1874, as to how many Volunteers he thought he could assemble for this purpose for even one month, to say nothing of a year or two, in time of need? It is scarcely necessary to say that Lord Bury found it convenient to leave this home question unanswered; nor have I met with any better success from any of the many Volunteer colonels to whom I have talked on the subject. They are all loud in declaring that "the Volunteers are ready for anything that may be required of them," which in the abstract nobody doubts; but when it comes to details as to numbers and periods of embodiment, there come on a vagueness and uncertainty that are, to say the least, not reliable elements in a military calculation.

A recent number (25th December, 1875) of the Volunteers' own organ, the *Volunteer Gazette*, devotes an elaborate article to proving that it is neither legal, reasonable, nor possible that they should be called out, "either by fourths at a time or in any other way," for any contingency whatsoever, except a distinct threat of actual and imminent invasion. It is at all events satisfactory to have any doubt on this point solved authoritatively by the self-appointed mouthpiece of our citizen-soldiers; and we would commend this article to Mr. Holms's serious consideration before he proposes to go further in doing away with the Militia.

Let me not be misunderstood. No one has a greater admiration for the Volunteer movement, and for Volunteers generally, than I have. I was one of those who, at the very infancy of the movement, ventured to say, when some military critics of the clubs sneered at it, that I could see no reason why Englishmen of higher physique, and of much higher education and intelligence, than the men of the line, with proper instruction and encouragement, should not become as good troops for home defence as any in the world; and the Volunteers have fulfilled, and more than fulfilled, my prediction.

But the question is not as to the high qualities of the Volunteers, which nobody who knows them doubts, but it is this: could they, and if they could, would they, take up the charge of our garrisons in permanent or even in temporary embodiment, in time of war, so as to relieve our whole regular army? In the absence of any proof

to that effect, I must continue, reluctantly, to believe the contrary. I have not the slightest doubt that, in case of invasion, we should get not only 170,000, but 300,000 of them under arms in twenty-four hours; and that you might rely upon them—all traffic and business of all sorts being necessarily suspended by invasion—to hold together as long as there remained a foreign soldier on our soil. To meet invasion they are, and will, I trust, continue to be for many years, our best and largest Home Reserve. But to talk of them as a substitute for the Militia is merely self-deception, and another of those popular fallacies so prevalent in this country, from our happy ignorance of practical military matters.

The sooner this pernicious fallacy is carefully examined, dissected, and then blown to atoms, the better for the prospects of a refoundation of our military strength on a sound basis.

So much, then, I think I am justified in assuming as a consequence of the argument that has gone before, *that an intermediate available force of some sort we must always have as a connecting link between the line and the Volunteers*, a force that will become embodied for permanent home service, perhaps extending over three years, immediately upon the declaration of war; and by thus relieving our line troops in the garrisons, arsenals, and great camps of the kingdom, release the whole available regular force of Great Britain, and a part of that of Ireland, for immediate operations abroad.

Such an intermediate force, of the necessary strength, we have not got in England at present, because the Militia are only half their numbers. And should Mr. Holms's measure be carried out, and the Militia abolished, we should have no semblance at all of such a force. The Volunteers, as I have carefully shown, cannot fill this gap; their functions are widely different. The *Volunteer Gazette* says frankly, and without any circumlocution, that they would not attempt it; that they are not intended for that sort of work.

It is evident that something must be done to amend our position, and that shortly; and grave and heavy will be the responsibility of the present war minister if the Session of 1876 passes without that something being done, to carry on a step further the successful labours of his predecessor. The twelve lines of strategical railways that Russia has built with English money since 1854, and which will be complete in two years hence; her 2,250,000 of armed men that her General Service decree of 1870 will make disposable in 1878; the tearing up the treaty of Paris; the 200,000 men kept constantly massed in the Caucasus, which, now that the Poti-Baku Railway and the steam flotilla on the Caspian are complete, are within thirty days' rail, steam, and march from Herat, are none of them defensive measures, and moreover they can be aimed offensively at nobody but us.

If I am unduly urgent, in season and out of season, for "something to be done," in the Session of 1876, it is because we must legislate now, if we are to be safe five years hence. No reform that we may now initiate, however wisely conceived it be, can give us, with our limited numbers, any appreciable result as regards infantry reserves, before 1881 or 1882. According to a trite, but true phrase, "a good deal may happen before then." There is, therefore, no time to be lost. Our military situation is simply this. With our line 4,000 below a reduced peace strength now; with the necessity of finding some 9,000 more recruits in 1877 staring us in the face, and an increasing demand impending in each year afterwards; with the Militia about 60,000 rank and file below its strength, and steadily decreasing too; with the recruiting returns of this year showing nearly 2,000 less than last year; it is too plainly evident, that the present system has ceased to supply us adequately with the free flow of men to the army and the Militia which we want, even in time of peace, and that it must inevitably utterly collapse and break down with the first strain of war.

To talk of successfully prosecuting a war, which we should begin with 65,000 men short of our home or defensive force, with such means, is simply folly.

The casualties of war are now calculated at about 40 per cent. of the infantry alone, during the first twelve months, and of the other arms in a less proportion. Is it not evident that within two months of the outbreak of war, we should be at our wits' end for men? Our present supply would not carry us successfully through the first three months of a stiff war against the conscripted thousands of Russia.

I have shown already at page 444, that one alternative proposed, viz., an endeavour to keep pace with the pecuniary rise of the labour market by increased pay alone, is wholly out of the question—even in peace time. It is well known now that the present government propose to meet this difficulty by an increase of pay only. I have no objection to that—if only it could be shown that it would be effectual and final.

But I do not hesitate to declare and avow my belief that increased pay *alone* will not solve the question. Experience in the past tells us so plainly. We had an increase of 2*d.* per man per diem to the line in 1867, and other advances to the Militia, making a total of just £500,000 a year. In 1873 again, we had another increase, which, between free ration of about 4½*d.* a day to the line, with corresponding deductions, amounted to about £180,000 a year. Neither of these has improved our position in the least. In fact, now, in 1876, we are considerably worse off as to supply of numbers and as to physique than we were in 1873: most decidedly, in physique, 20 per cent. worse off than we were in 1867. Why, then, should we

expect greater results from the proposed increase of pay in 1876? The increased demand for labour is a steadily rising tide. It has swamped us on both these former occasions, and will do it again in three or four years hence, just when it will be too late to apply any other remedy effectually. With this worse result; that though we are in profound peace now, quite possibly four years hence, or 1880, may find us on the verge of a general European war. "

What is to be done then? Must we come, as so many insist, to compulsory service for the Militia in its old objectionable form, as applied during the war with France, at the beginning of the century? Is there no intermediate course open? I believe that there is: one widely different from, and yet more effectual than, a pure compulsory service; a mode as opposed to conscription, or to ballot for the Militia, as now popularly understood, as the voluntary labour of hired men is the opposite of slavery. And so believing, and with the earnest desire to solve this question satisfactorily, I venture to submit, in all diffidence, for the careful and deliberate judgment of the people of England, that which I believe to be the groundwork of a sound system of national defence.

I believe this remedy to be in a joint application of two distinct means to the same end. Not doubled estimates, but a small and carefully graduated increase of pay, as deferred pay, to the line, and consequently to the line reserve also. Not conscription, or anything like it; not even ballot for the Militia, in the sense in which it was understood between 1805 and 1815, or even in the form in which many would desire to reapply it now; but a general national training to arms, almost entirely optional and voluntary, the principal inducement being the large money prizes to be gained by the wage-earning class by previous training, and temporary engagement in time of war; but with just so much of a wholly altered and restricted ballot applied to the formation of a Local Militia, as would, while forming only a subordinate feature in the scheme, serve to regulate and methodize it throughout. A general national training to arms, commencing with boys at school at twelve years of age, and extended, once a week on Saturdays only, till the age of twenty-one. But regulated so as to produce, by means of a modified ballot, for a strictly local militia, 36,000 men a year, selected by lot from the whole number trained, on whom would devolve the embodiment for local garrison service, *only in time of war, and then only for three months in each year for each individual; thus to take the place of the present Militia.* The basis would be the ballot, compulsion it is true; but compulsion only adopted to that limited extent which the nation shall deliberately and unanimously consent to accept, after the fullest examination of the question in all its bearings through its representatives in Parliament. I do devoutly believe that if we can divest our minds of long-standing prejudices, and

look at things as they are, and not as they seem to be, the way out of this difficulty is not hard to devise. If we have the moral courage not to turn away and stop our ears at the first sound of the horrible name "ballot," but to face this spectre boldly, and handle it; familiarise ourselves with it, and learn its details thoroughly, so as to know what to adopt under restriction, and what to reject uncompromisingly; what to bear cheerfully as equitable, and what to resist constitutionally to the last inch; our task will lighten as we proceed. The proposition of a modified ballot for Militia is not to be dismissed in a sentence, either for admission or rejection. It is a complex one, and contains quite such opposite elements, of intolerable evil if abused, and yet of vast available good if judiciously used, as those indicated above. I believe, under calm examination, a system of sound yet easy general national training can be devised, which, as coupled with a strictly modified ballot *for a strictly local Militia*, can be made not only tolerable, but perfectly acceptable to our proud, captious, liberty-loving people. It is time that the generous lesson the Volunteers have given us should bear fruit in a more extended voluntary assumption of a duty that belongs to us all alike, but has hitherto been borne by only a section of the nation.

The very first condition towards the military burden of the nation being assumed, voluntarily, by all, would be, that it should be so equitably adjusted as to bear equally upon all, "without partiality, favour, or affection." The details of this might and probably would even include a graduated payment from the richer to the poorer classes as compensation for the loss of their time, which is to the labouring class the bread of their families; this compensation to be arranged according to income.

We require, then, to substitute for the present Militia one purely local in its liability, subject to embodiment only in war time, *and then only for three months in each year for each individual*; with this further restrictive probability, that as the improved means of communication allow men to assemble so rapidly at local centres now, the class of the *current year*, that is, the class under drill at the time of the breaking out of war, would probably suffice for all purposes of defence of the garrisons while being thus trained for six months, and the others, after being once drilled, *would probably only be called out in turn for six weeks in the year, even during the hottest war*. The cost to the country of four reliefs in the year would undoubtedly be considerable; but the indirect gain to the revenue from only 30,000 instead of 120,000 pair of hands being withdrawn from productive industry at one time, would more than compensate for it.

This plan can be worked so as to be burdensome to none, and to entail scarcely greater individual loss of liberty than the Volunteers

have voluntarily and spiritedly taken upon themselves, for the nation's good, for the last sixteen years. I freely admit that, in this respect, they are my model, that they have taught me the lesson I here strive to utilise. I am, I hope, above all things, a staunch Liberal. The principle of our constitution that I hold the dearest is, that of the perfect equality of every man as before the law.

In advocating, then, a modified form of Militia ballot in order to save us from national humiliation, it need scarcely be said that the present Ballot Law (suspended annually since 1829 and permanently since 1860) would not be tolerated now for one moment. No government could venture to revive it in any emergency, however great, and I said so repeatedly last year; for it contains the gross injustice of two forms of exemption of the most inequitable, I had almost said iniquitous, nature; one exempting a man who pays a £10 fine, the other for every man who becomes an effective Volunteer at his own expense. Neither of these exemptions could be dreamt of for a moment now. They would be simply privileged class evasions of a general and public duty, which could only exist in the dark times of popular non-representation, or misrepresentation, before the Reform Bill of 1832.

Their result, if ever revived, would be to form a net, through the meshes of which every man of an income over, say, £3 a week might escape; while every poorer man would be bound to serve compulsorily. It is superfluous to say, those who fought so wisely and so well last year for the amendment of the Labour Laws would not tolerate this for a moment.

To divest ourselves of erroneous popular notions, let us see, first of all, what is Conscription?

It is the practice, prevalent in foreign countries, of taking men forcibly from their homes to serve; first as soldiers; secondly, in the regular army; thirdly, in war abroad. How does this resemble a Militia ballot? A modified ballot for a purely local Militia would be the reverse of all this, on all three main points. It would in fact not only be the opposite of conscription in every particular, but it would make conscription for ever impossible in England, by showing that it was totally unnecessary. The balloted local militiaman would serve, first, near his own home; secondly, not in the regular army, but in a local Militia consisting of his acquaintances and neighbours, and under no circumstances whatever, abroad; and thirdly, could never be engaged in war, except in the case of invasion, for the defence of his own home; which is what the Volunteers have already spontaneously undertaken.

What would a balloted local militiaman's liability amount to? That, if war occurred in the same year in which he was balloted, he might be kept in a camp or garrison for six months; his wife and

family, if he had any, being meanwhile supported by the State, and he receiving free food, lodging, clothing, and 2s. a day pay.

If war occurred in any of the three following years to that in which he was balloted, his time of embodiment would only be six weeks.

And by his twenty-fifth birthday he would be entirely free from liability of any sort to the State. Never, under any circumstances, could he be sent out of the United Kingdom; never could he be engaged with an enemy unless that enemy had already landed on our shores. The legal liability of the Volunteers after embodiment by order in Council, is already, I repeat, precisely this. Further, as the period of liability to be called out would only extend to four years, from twenty-one to twenty-five years of age, the chances would be ten to one against a man's ever being called out at all during his time of liability. It might happen once in a generation.

The number of young men reaching twenty-one years of age annually in England and Scotland is about 225,000. This plan does not of course apply to Ireland. That country, in consideration of her exceptional circumstances, and her only recently revived prosperity, ought to be exempted from any species of compulsory service for many years to come, and should be left free to supply, as heretofore, the line and her own Militia with such men as choose to embrace a military life voluntarily. It would be manifestly neither politic nor just to do otherwise, considering what might be the position of a balloted Irish militiaman in relation to questions which affect closely both his religion and his politics.

By drawing 36,000 men annually to the Militia, or about one man in every six, which, deducting casualties, would give eventually an effective force of about 30,000 from each year's class, the total in four years, the limit of time proposed, would be about 120,000. Enough to admit of a fresh relief of 30,000 every three months to the garrisons in time of war, as proposed by the mobilisation scheme for the Volunteers, and yet not too much for the defence of the kingdom, if the whole 120,000, in addition to 21,490 Irish Voluntary Militia, and to 170,000 Volunteers, were called out together to meet invasion: the regular army, all but 20,000 in the garrisons, being at the same time engaged in a foreign war.

The Local Militia should be chosen by ballot from all classes, without substitution or money exemption. Religious scruples against military service, such as those of the Quakers, and the family exemptions for domestic reasons, common to all countries, should be the only ones admitted.

I have said that the ballot would be the means of selection. But once that was conceded as a principle, the great aim of the State would of course be to lighten the burden by every possible means. To this end the great engine would be a gratuitous preliminary

Anticipatory Training for all who chose to accept it, from the age of twelve to that of twenty-one; with this great object, by anticipating the chances of the ballot, to make the training *subsequent* to being drawn as short as possible.

This would lighten the obligation, especially to the wage-earning class, so as to reduce it, in practice, to next to nothing, while at the same time the *possible* power of keeping a man out for six months when balloted, though it would probably never require to be used, could be judiciously managed so as to get the highest degree of military efficiency, by making it worth every man's while to work to the best of his ability, both at the preparatory drill school and at the four weeks subsequently at the brigade dépôt.

This great lever of ballot, then, properly used, would effect two great results:—

First, It would train about one-half to one-third of the effective youth of the nation to a partial, yet a very considerable, knowledge of arms.

Second, It would fully repay the country for any outlay, for these thousands of partly trained men, probably about 120,000 a year, would represent so much more immediately available reinforcement for the Volunteers in case of invasion.

Having fixed the maximum time of drill for a militiaman at six months as Mr. Hardy's Militia Laws Consolidation Act did last year, the State should freely give every man in the country, rich and poor alike, the means, gratuitously, of anticipating his possible chance of being caught by the ballot at twenty-one years of age. By thus enabling him by previous drill, first at school from twelve to sixteen, and then in a Government military drill school from sixteen to twenty-one, to qualify himself beforehand, at his leisure hours, and therefore without pecuniary loss, once in ten days say, extended over those five last years, so that he could pass as a drilled soldier within three, four, five, or six weeks after being caught by the ballot, it would confer a great boon upon the classes whose time is their money, and the burden of the ballot would become thus almost nominal.

Time gained is the first object, and the second object, and the third object, in modern war. And the value of the time thus gained in previous instruction and preparation, and having about one-third of the effective youth of the country so far taught as to be able to take up arms, in defensive positions, at a week's notice, would be incalculable in a money point of view. It is the system that enables Switzerland to hold her own, and preserves her frontiers from violation. Thus could this great change be accomplished with no loss, or next to none, to the working classes, to whom of course it would be a greater object than to richer men to anticipate the future training. The Government Drill Schools, superintended by carefully chosen, efficient regular officers, should be open every

night in the week, except Sundays. Working men would probably drill on Saturday afternoons only. Professional men, tradesmen, and men of leisure, would suit themselves, on any evening, or night, they pleased. A close register would be carefully kept at each school of every individual's attendance—dates, hours, and progress. It would become a detail for future consideration whether the poorer working men—earning, say, less than five-and-twenty shillings a week—should not be paid 2*d.* an hour for good drill, especially if they had any distance to come in the country. Payment always to be conditional on the completion of so many—a fixed, qualifying number of drills.

The process of gradual national instruction would be thus. In every school throughout the country, a Government drill instructor, an old soldier, qualified by a certificate, and paid 2*s.* a week extra to his pension, would attend, one afternoon in a week, for two hours, to drill the boys, over twelve and under sixteen, in a few simple, marching movements (strictly according to the Field Exercise) in gymnastics and drill, without arms.

This step alone would effect one great and good thing. It would improve the health, physique, and bearing of hundreds of thousands of boys, and teach them habits of order, regularity, obedience, and combined action. No one who has read the touching accounts of the burning of the *Goliath*, of the heroism, devotion, and generosity shown there by the boys, can doubt the moral as well as physical good such a training to combined effort would do the nation.

As to the more advanced Government Drill Schools. These should be scattered over the country as widely as possible, but with careful regard to the necessary localities. They could best be formed by Government taking over, at a liberal valuation, or acquiring temporarily at an agreed rent, the present Volunteer drill sheds and halls, all over the country; which, however, could still be used for their present purposes, though enlarged if necessary.

My object is not to sweep away the Volunteer system, but to utilise it as much as possible, by grafting it on, and partially incorporating it with, the new proposed local Militia system. They would thus be two great means, each totally distinct in composition, in quality, and in degree of the military obligation they each incurred, but both working harmoniously together to the same end—the national defence. The present Volunteer corps would lend local assistance to the anticipatory drill of the local Militia by leasing them their sheds; the local Militia training staff would infuse a far greater element of order, regularity, and discipline into the Volunteers, who used the same drill places, but in entirely distinct classes, by the indirect example of their more stringent military organization, habits, and responsibility. This is my answer to Lord Bury's most reasonable challenge that the Volunteer system should not be

annihilated, but utilised. I perfectly agree with him; and it will be a matter of pleasure to me if experienced and zealous Volunteer Commanding Officers will consider the subject and throw out valuable suggestions for the development and perfection of the proposed system. Moreover, any man whom the ballot had *once passed over* would be free to join the Volunteers. No doubt thousands would do so. The two systems thus would mutually help each other.

But to use the ballot as Lord Elcho wishes, as I hope he will pardon me for saying he evidently does,¹ as merely a means towards forming a gigantic Volunteer army, double the present numbers, but under no more stringent conditions of service than at present, would be disastrous. It would be to repeat most inexcusably the great mistake of our early experiment in 1803, which of course failed from its own inherent and incurable vices. The full account of that failure will be found in Mr. Clode's excellent book, "The Military Forces of the Crown," at page 314, vol. I. Mr. Windham, taunting Mr. Addington with this failure, in the debate of the 9th December, 1803 (See Hansard, Old Series, vol. I., page 179), said, "The right honourable gentleman has not only *not* provided an army, he has made it impossible that an army should ever be provided. For" (by this misapplication of the ballot) "he has locked up 420,000 men, out of an available strength of 500,000, in an army of Volunteers," where they were of no use either for permanent embodiment, or to re-inforce the line. It is to be hoped that all future modifications of the ballot will at all events avoid this fatal mistake.

Now, as to the indirect action of this limited ballot upon the line,—not the least important of its probable effects. If once ballot is recognised by the nation in its limited application to the provision of a local Militia from all classes of society, and not from a small section of one class only, the *indirect* stimulus given to recruiting for the line will be enormous. In this way. The gentleman, or professional man, or tradesman, balloted for the Militia, will, I grant, rarely, if ever, be induced to volunteer for the line, except under the impetus of a great popular war. With the working man or artizan, earning a pound a week or less, if thus balloted, the case would be entirely different. He will deliberately weigh his pecuniary chances in the two lines of military service then open to him—the one compulsory and non-paying, the other voluntary and highly remunerative. And many a fine young fellow, who would never look at the army as now constituted and paid, will then reason with himself thus: "I am balloted for the Militia. I shall be called out for five or six weeks' drill this year certain. And any time during the next four years, if war break out I may be put into a garrison

(1) See his speech to the Volunteers, at the Shaftesbury Park Estate, on 5th June, 1876, and his letter to the *Daily News* of the 21st January, 1876.

or camp for three months each year; getting only 8*d.* a day clear, and perhaps permanently losing my engagement at my employer's. I shall thus be out of work perhaps four or five months; and if I complete this militia liability, I shall have nothing to show for it at the end. Why not volunteer for the line at once for three years home¹ service? I shall come back with £18 to £20 in my pocket. I never can hope to save the half of that at my trade. Besides my lump of hard cash, I shall have earned 6*d.* a day reserve pay to keep me for the next nine years at my business. Here goes for the line, for three years' Home Service."

The regular army will thus get many a promising recruit, whose vacancy in the local Militia will be at once filled up by ballot. If this source only gives us 6,000 men a year out of the 36,000 the ballot would annually catch, it will have done a great deal; quite enough, together with the stimulated voluntary enlistment at increased pay (see further, p. 459), to keep the line quite full, and to fill it with the right stamp of men.

But the most momentous bearing of a general national training, used conjointly with a system of anticipatory drill, to forestall the chance of the ballot, has yet to be considered. I have estimated the probable numbers that would take advantage of the anticipatory instruction at about 120,000 a year; or half of the youth attaining twenty-one years of age annually. This would give, in five years' time, a body of about 500,000 men (deducting for deaths, &c.), who were, more or less, trained to arms.

They would have each undergone, probably, first, 40 drills a year of 2 hours each at school, for 4 years, equal to 160 drills; and about 40 drills a year of 2 hours each on Saturday, for 5 years, at the Government drill schools, equal to 200 drills, or a total of 720 hours' drill each; equal, excluding fractions, at 3 drills a day, to about 240 days, or 8 months of continuous drill; or, deducting for the effects of intermission, say only equal to 4 months of continuous drill. This is, however, a vast amount of instruction when combined with the gradually acquired habit of discipline. Of these 500,000, perhaps a quarter, or 125,000 out of the whole, would be of the class and pecuniary circumstances to be liable to be tempted by a large war bounty, say 25 or 30, or even 40 guineas, to volunteer for the line in time of war *for the duration of the campaign only*. This is the most effective mode of getting men in large quantities at short notice and for short periods.

(1) An article in *The Times* of the 28th December last showed that under the new system of linked battalions the period of any one regiment's home service can now be foreseen and known to a certainty, except in case of war. The recruit could thus ensure three years' home service, by choosing a regiment which had five or six years' home service yet to run. Men now enlisted are allowed the widest choice; and an officer, not under the rank of colonel, is present, at their final engagement, to advise them on that choice.

If any one doubts that such a general national training to arms, with the ballot as a regulator and incentive only, would be conceived in the direct and immediate interests of the working, or wage-earning, class, let him consider the subject for a moment in its operation on volunteering on the breaking out of a great European war.

As I have shown, our present system, and I fear any possible modification of it also, would leave us at the end of two months' hostilities at our wits' end for men. But that is just the crisis in which the vast benefit of the "anticipatory training," to both the individual and the State, would come into play. The working man who had escaped the ballot altogether, but who had, between the ages of twelve and twenty-one, obtained from the State a gratuitous military training of 720 occasional drills, the equivalent, as I have said, of four months' consecutive drill, would at once command the situation. His military marketable value, as a partially-drilled soldier, would be at least £25; and he could secure this amount of bounty at once, by walking into the nearest barrack, and engaging for the line, for the duration of the campaign only. This rests on actual facts. In the second year of the Crimean war, the bounty for a cavalry recruit reached £10, for an infantry recruit £8; and the levy money in each case was respectively £11 13s. 6d. and £9 18s. 6d. more; making a total of £21 13s. 6d. for a man enlisting for cavalry, and for infantry £17 18s. 6d. This was for a totally untrained and often immature lad of 5 feet 2 inches. The value of a robust working man, twenty-six or twenty-seven years of age, with muscles in hard, working training, already a drilled soldier, more highly disciplined than any present Volunteer, from the fact that his occasional training—and therefore gradual military indoctrination—had extended over nine years, would manifestly be much more. At the outset of war he might command £25, rapidly rising, as the war continued, to probably £40, or more. The bounty to volunteers during the American war of 1861-65 went up to £50, and then to £60, a man; and doubtless with us it would be higher if the war lasted: for in the Peninsular times it amounted, in some cases, to 60 guineas for a Militia substitute, and the average price for a line recruit, from 1808 to 1814, was £40.

Thus the national anticipatory training would put the working classes of this country not only in the position of being on an equality, or at no pecuniary disadvantage, with richer men, if caught by the operation of the ballot for the Militia, but in war time would give them a highly remunerative war value, acquired without cost to themselves, and without having been withdrawn one hour from their ordinary industrial occupations.

I therefore confidently affirm that this modification of any future Ballot Act is that for which any Liberal reformer, and every Labour representative, should strenuously and uncompromisingly strive.

At all events, if this be not adopted, let us, who have those interests at heart, insist on hearing nothing more henceforth about the application of the ballot to the Militia, in any other way, such, for instance, as Lord Elcho's proposition, which would be distinctly opposed to Labour-class interests. And it is self-evident that this national system would be best for the State also. For, first, it is the only means which we can ever hope for of rapidly expanding our peace establishment army of 100,000 men to a war force of 200,000. No Reserve system whatever, be it Lord Cardwell's, or any amplification of that, will ever bring our war force, for operations abroad, to more than from 120,000 to 140,000 infantry; and it will take at least eight years more to do that, whereas a general training would give us the means of deploying 200,000 in five years from this time. Then, as was the case with the Americans in 1865, immense economy would ensue from the immediate disbanding of the temporarily engaged men on the termination of the campaign, with a gratuity of three months' pay per man. Of the 600,000 men who marched past the President at Washington in April and May, 1865, after the defeat of the South, before six weeks 500,000 had returned quietly into civil life and to industrial pursuits. And we might similarly reduce a field army of 200,000 by at least 60,000, in a month. Of course, a liberal scale of widows' pensions, and of gratuities for wounds, would have to be adjusted to the conditions of service of these temporarily engaged men. But such a general training would establish at once a flexible mode of ready expansion suited both to our military, industrial, and economical needs. This would be a measure neither Prussian nor French, but essentially English.

Probably it would be very rare—with the immense incentive to diligence that the *power* of detention would give, and at three drills a day, under competent and practised instructors at the brigade depôts,—it would be very rare, I say, for a man to be kept more than four or five weeks—including musketry—before being dismissed home as a “passed” and trained Local Militiaman.

Once the principle is accepted, a hundred ways would be found by our practical, quick-witted people, for lessening the time of drill, and yet keeping the instruction effective, for all practical purposes.

This, as will be seen, is no intolerable burden; it would, indeed, be scarcely felt even by the poorest, to the moderately well-off and the rich, it would be mere healthy pastime. Yet by means of judicious use of the great lever of the power of detention, it would undoubtedly give us, *what we have not now, and never shall have under any existing system*, a local Militia, composed of the flower of the youth of the country, at their best and freest age, highly disciplined; drilled to that extent, that with six weeks' more continuous embodiment (and we shall always have at least that amount of warning before an invasion) they would be equal to any local troops in the

world ; and with this advantage, which no other plan can give us, that their numbers, though only 120,000, would be always full to the complete establishment. The power of counting upon absolutely certain numbers, at a certain place and time, without fail, is worth all else besides, in a military calculation.

And one immediate effect would be, that when men of wealth, intelligence, and education were in the local Militia ranks, the officers of Militia would require to be both more thoroughly educated professionally, and of the highest social standing. Every man, in every grade of military life, would be raised one step higher. Men of the highest birth and position would be proud to compete, and to carefully qualify themselves professionally, for the active command of their county local Militia regiments.

The scheme may seem an ambitious one, but for a great and rich country like this a wide and comprehensive military policy, adapted to every circumstance and every class of its people, is the most economical in the end. The money-saving, by adopting a general training, together with a modified ballot for the Militia, would be about £160,000 a year upon the two items of bounty now given to Militia recruits on enlistment and on the item of bounties annually to men re-engaging in the Militia Reserve.

But the ultimate saving in reduced estimates would be considerable. And as the bounty to Militia recruits would cease at once after 1st January, 1878, there would be, immediately the system came into force, about £160,000 available annually, which could be employed in increased pay to the line.

The scheme of this paper has throughout contemplated a close adherence to the great national principle that for the regular army—that is, for colonial service and war service abroad—men must be got solely by making it worth their while pecuniarily ; which means increased advantages in the shape of a slightly increased pay, but far better applied and distributed.

The means to this end for the line are contained in the principle of Deferred Pay, in lieu of pensions. Thus, and thus only, can line service be made the thing I have often desired to see it—a paying career for the working class.

A rise of 2*d.* a day to the private soldier, and in proportion to the non-commissioned ranks, would, I am persuaded, if applied in the shape of deferred pay, *and simultaneously with the application of ballot to a local Militia*, and with an increased pay of 6*d.* and 8*d.* to the Army Reserve men (according as they went into the Reserve after three or six years' service), get us out of all our difficulties. The total cost of this increased pay to line and Reserve would be under £500,000 a year.

The system of deferred pay would answer the same purpose as regards the soldier, that the friendly and benefit societies do for the

labourer and artisan. It would be a perfectly fair bargain for the State to drive with the man, to make him thus thrifty in spite of himself, and compel him to provide for the future; even though it be at first against his will. Of course this deferred pay should belong inalienably to the soldier. It should be subject to no deductions whatever, and not liable to forfeiture for any crime he might commit, except the one offence of desertion.

Fourpence a day, thus banked for three years, with interest, would send the man to the Reserve with £20 to his credit, or if he served six years, he would leave with some £40 to £43: a sum which a labourer or farm servant may wait half a lifetime before he can accumulate. On passing into the Reserve, two-thirds of the accumulated sum should be paid to him at once to set him up in civil life, and the other third retained, still at interest, as a guarantee against his absconding or emigrating. The pay of the Army Reserve, also, should be raised slightly. Fourpence a day, the present Reserve retaining fee, is totally insufficient. It is barely enough to keep a man from starvation; and most soldiers who have taken it would be only too glad to be back with their regiments if they could return.

Short service and deferred pay, and increased Reserve pay, I say again, on this improved scale, would make the army a profitable career for the working-class.

To recapitulate the heads of reform: Establish general national training, distributed as follows:—

1. Drill in schools from twelve to sixteen years of age, under old, certificated, soldier-instructors.

2. Higher Government drill schools for adults, for the “anticipatory drill,” previous to ballot.

3. A modified ballot, to select a local Militia.

4. Drill, at brigade depôts, *after* ballot, the legal maximum to be six months, reducible by individual diligence to three or four weeks or less, according to the proficiency of the man.

5. Higher drill (officers’) schools, having their head-quarters in each London Guards’ Barrack, at Aldershot, Chatham for Engineers, Colchester, Plymouth, Woolwich, lastly the Curragh and Edinburgh, for Militia and Volunteer officers.

6. Increased pay for the line of 2*d.* a day, as Deferred Pay.

7. Increase of the Reserve pay, to 6*d.* after three, and 8*d.* after six years’ line service; in each case with 2*d.* a day banked, at 4 per cent., to the end of the term of service.

And finally. 8. A short course at the Military Colleges of Sandhurst and Woolwich, for future officers for the local Militia.

The gradual means for bringing a local Militia into existence would be,—

1. Pass an Amended Ballot Law in 1877, to come into force on 1st January, 1878.

2. After July, 1877, enlist no more men voluntarily for the Militia, except those who would engage, at the time of enlistment, to serve in the Militia Reserve also; of course with the present additional annual bounty; *thus gradually converting the whole existing Militia, by purely optional and voluntary means, into a reinforcement for the line for war abroad.*

3. Open drill schools at every Volunteer head-quarters in town and country, including the company head-quarters of scattered administrative battalions, and invite those who would be liable to be drawn after the 1st January, 1878, viz., all the thousands of youths *now* of eighteen and nineteen years of age, to commence drilling at once, in order to anticipate the ballot.

4. By January, 1879, the present militia, from recruiting being discontinued, would have fallen off by about 30,000 men. The first draft of balloted men, to be called out for four, five, or six weeks' drill, according to proficiency, in March, 1878, would be 36,000 men. Between August, 1876, and March, 1878, they could work out seventy-two drills each. By March, 1881, the whole Militia would be composed of balloted men, and the whole of the present Militia would have either passed into the Militia Reserve, volunteered to the line under the increased pay and deferred pay inducements, or would have ceased their military engagement altogether. The men balloted in 1878 and 1879 would have to come out for a month each in the following year; as between 1876 and 1878 they could only, working their best, put in seventy or eighty drills each. After the third year of the system this could be eased off. By the beginning of 1882 we could look around us with confidence; having a full Line, a full local Militia, and a Volunteer force rather above its present strength. Our available force, in 1882, would stand as follows:—

	Men.
Local Militia in England and Scotland selected by lot from all classes of society	120,000
Irish Voluntary Militia, as at present	22,000
The Volunteer Force, say	180,000
Yeomanry Cavalry and Enrolled Pensioners, as at present	37,000
The above available <i>only</i> for Home Defence	359,000
Available for service abroad we should have¹:—	
Army Reserve, as now gradually forming (see page 433)	42,000
Reinforcements to the Army Reserve, by drafting in men of 3 years' service, say 3,000 a year only, for the next 6 years, as soon as a flow of recruits was secured	18,000
Army Reserve, total	60,000

(1) The present Militia Reserve would have ceased to exist by the expiry of their engagements.

on military service, but as a matter of demonstration he has, I trust he will pardon my saying, failed to prove his case. The replies of Mr. Hardy showed this conclusively last session; and he had the advantage of having the figures of Mr. Holms's scheme worked out for him, and thoroughly sifted by the most able official experts, both military and civil, before he spoke. I regret to say that a close examination of the figures, which I felt myself bound to make independently, has led me to the same result and conclusions.

The "doubled payment" plan is chimerical. It would cause immensely swollen expenditure in time of peace, and would utterly break down at the first strain of war. It starts with some 60,000 less men.

The plan of a general Voluntary Training, and a modified Militia ballot, on the other hand, I have endeavoured to show, can be worked so as to be scarcely any burden at all to individuals. Constant means would be found to lighten its individual weight when once it was adopted, and instead of being anything like the bugbear conscription, *it would make conscription (which is compulsory service for the Regular Army) for ever impossible.*

A general national training for England would be the surest guarantee for the continued peace of the world. It would be decidedly in the direct interest of the working classes, both to those who would thus insist that the old unjust law should never be revived, to their special detriment, and those who by the indirect action of an amended law, would find a new and profitable career opened to them, both in better-paid short service in the Line and Reserve, or in highly-paid temporary service in war. A more thoroughly Radical measure than such a General Voluntary Training, together with a modified Militia Ballot, it is impossible to conceive.

I altogether disclaim any desire to dogmatise on this subject. I am not wedded to the proposed scheme, but merely submit it as one possible solution added to the many now before the public. The details can be modified indefinitely. I have attempted to sketch the main principles on which I believe a great, flexible, popular, national training to arms might be based. It contains undoubtedly a compulsory principle; but the compulsion is as but an ounce to a ton of voluntarism. It is used more as a stimulus and a regulator to the national training than as a legal burden.

The figures here given are entirely based upon parliamentary and official documents. I have endeavoured to represent the present condition of our army accurately; concealing nothing, palliating nothing, neither exaggerating our weakness nor overstating our strength. My object is to invite discussion. If the result be to elicit the declaration *that neither in this extremely modified form, nor in any shape whatsoever, will the country tolerate any degree of compulsion, how-*

ever minimised, I for one shall not be disappointed. On the contrary, my object—to bring this question to a crisis—will be attained. We shall then have a clear and definite basis of expressed public opinion to go upon; and it is essential to have this soon. Henceforth we who desire economy must then be dumb; the only alternative left will be a largely-increased expenditure, and our task will be narrowed to selecting carefully from the several rival schemes for increased estimates that one which may appear soundest and best.

But I cannot conceal my apprehension that increased money alone will never accomplish our object. The desideratum is to make the army a national career. This can never happen till, in one shape or another, the richer classes—who are now standing aloof; who let the defence of the country be done for them vicariously, and who thus cast discredit on the profession of arms—voluntarily assume their share of the burden which is morally owing from them to this country of free institutions. Money alone I firmly believe, won't do what we want. A re-adjustment of the burden of Military Home Service, taking all classes alike, equally just to all, and yet affording a lucrative career of short service in the army to the poorer sections of the labouring classes, would, I believe, solve the difficulty. If we are grown so selfish, so apathetic, and so fond of ease, that we won't tolerate even this very slight restriction of individual convenience—I won't call it of individual liberty—for the national good, and in preservation of the peace of the world, then we must not grumble at opening our purse-strings very wide. We must be content to go on increasingly paying for our soldiers, whatever augmented price labour may periodically continue to rise to, and be also content to get an ever increasingly lower stamp of men. And having paid, and paid profusely for years, it is my firm belief that we shall still fail in maintaining an efficient army by that means alone; and that we shall be compelled at last, on the outbreak of war, to come to the Ballot for Militia; perhaps after deep national humiliation and the fruitless sacrifice of thousands of brave men to a false system.

H. M. HAVELOCK.

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE decisive repulse of Don Carlos among the stony hills of northern Spain ; the remonstrance by the great powers with the Sultan at Constantinople ; the trial of the alleged leaders of the Whisky Ring at Saint Louis ; the opening of another session of the British parliament ; the election of a French chamber of deputies ;—these are the topics of a month. They all stand for phases in the evolution of the world's destiny, some of them very slight in significance, but one of them at least of something like capital importance. Perhaps even what looks so trivial an affair as the attempt to convict and punish the official defrauders of the revenue in the United States may be at bottom more important for civilisation than affairs of more august association. To purge the great democratic experiment of those elements of administrative corruption that make so fatal a mark upon it, must be an object of prime interest for all who have any faith in the future of the free government of nations by themselves. Less important than the purification of public life in America, is the victory in Spain of one kind of absolutism over another and a blacker kind of absolutism. A defeat of Carlists, even if decisive, hardly ends anything for Spain, when the defeat is effected in the interests of such a monarchy as King Alfonso's. The world knows what to expect from the monarchs of a Restoration. If we knew no more, the King's assurance in his speech on opening the Cortes (Feb. 15) that the "representatives of Spain and the Vatican are engaged in regulating the pending questions in the manner required by the interests of the Church and the State," is a word of doubtful omen. The deposed Queen is to return to her son's court. When the last Carlist partisan has hidden away his arms for his son to use the next time, no one who knows what a restored Bourbon is, and what the Spanish republican is, will feel that Spain is yet in the path of stable conditions. The extinction of Carlism, however, even for a generation, and even if it be but the signal for treading once more the sterile road of modern Spanish history, is welcome as a blow and a discouragement to the Black Party in Europe. The next centre of that party's attack on civilisation lies in a very different quarter, and the battle is to be fought with weapons from a different armoury—the steady attempt to wrest constitutionalism in Belgium to the purposes of clerical absolutism progresses, with a success that may be some solace for the defeats of Don Carlos.

The diplomatic agitation in Eastern Europe, after reaching its height in the resolution of the English Government to support the Andrassy Note, has for the moment lulled. We see how a mouse may creep from the labouring mountain. The Sultan promises to execute the reforms which Europe commends to him, and things will be after the promise exactly where they were before. The participation of the English Government

in the diplomatic action that has been taken, is an event of no considerable significance. "There is a kind of sensation," said Lord Salisbury a few days ago, "a thrill, a longing for action, a desire for a definite aim to be stated, and a definite policy announced." This may be so, but mere adhesion to the presentation of Count Andrassy's Note does not go very far towards gratifying such a sensation, and longing for action, and thrill. Nor is the present foreign minister at all likely to deal in the satisfaction of thrills and sensations. He is, as we must never forget, the man of the Luxemburg Guarantee, nor was his policy in 1867, in the Cretan rising, in the least respect outside that of the very strictest member of that Manchester school, which Lord Derby's party and its organs are accustomed to describe in such contemptuous and splenetic terms. And English opinion has moderated. Time brings roses even to the holder of Turkish bonds. Nobody of sense would raise a finger to keep the Turk at Constantinople, and we shall never again drift towards the objects of the Crimean War. But one or two tempering considerations have had time to make their way into opinion. Is it not always best to leave a violent solution of any political situation to the very latest possible moment, if it must at last be violent, and may it not be the wisest policy for comparatively disinterested powers like England, France, and Germany, to trust to some dissolving process in the Turkish Empire, which shall be at the same time a pacifically constructive process? It may be that the populations of modern Turkey, like those of old Poland, are, in spite of Servia and of Montenegro, wholly without the power of political construction, that they lack any patient, strong, clever race like the House of Savoy. But, after the first burst of sympathy with Herzegovinian patriotism, and the first burst of fury at unpaid interest, there has been a return to the old preference in England for seeing the Turk replaced at Constantinople by one of his own group of subject peoples, rather than by a Romanoff or a Hapsburg. Is it certain, again, that Austria herself is so much more free from internal distraction and from risk of break-up, than Turkey? And, again, England ceases to be a disinterested power when we are told by one good authority that, though it might be very well to drive the Sultan across the Bosphorus, yet the Sultan in Arabia might be a serious trouble, as he has already been a slight trouble, to us in our Eastern Empire; and by another good authority that a single Turkish battalion appearing at Bombay with the standard of the Sultan would be a worse danger to us than a whole Russian army on the Affghan frontier, because every Mahometan in India would be bound by all he holds sacred to rise and follow the symbol of the Padishah. Such points as these are coming out more prominently. They certainly tend to check anything like a policy of thrill and sensation, so far as England is concerned. They do not affect the general proposition that it would probably be best, if such a measure were possible and stood alone, for an Austrian force to help the Sultan in the execution of the required reforms. We may, however, do well to remember that in 1867, when Russia, France, Prussia, and Italy requested the Porte to include their representatives in the Commission for investigating Cretan grievances, the Porte refused to make even this partial and temporary surrender of sovereignty. The Sultan is too likely to adopt the same attitude now.

The electoral campaign in France, ending in the repulse of M. Buffet and the return of a decisive republican majority, is the most thoroughly satisfactory event in Europe since the ruin of the Empire at Sedan. It is perhaps the most hopeful incident for social progress, since the victory of democracy in the United States ten years ago. In the first place it assures, or seems to assure, the final establishment of the only form of government that can ever be finally established in France. The Republic has been set up before now, but never the Republic of good sense. In 1792 and in 1848 the spirit of the nation was higher than it is now, and its mood more lofty and imposing, and on both occasions there were leaders of dazzling quality. But there was no political experience. The lesson had not been learnt, what are the limits of political action in social amelioration. The political capacity of France was pitiable, and her bad fortune was extraordinary. Good sense has not often had a chance until within the last three years, when a chief made his way to the front, who has the singular gift of investing this mere good sense with all the magnificence, sonorousness, and brilliance of attraction, that have hitherto been reserved to decorate the dreams and chimeras of politics. Gambetta has made political common sense as inspiring as the Rights of Man in 1785 and as Socialism in 1848. He has given it a size and spaciousness and imaginative colour which has made even the fiery and generously inflammable spirits of Belleville not only contented but enthusiastic. And what is curious is that Gambetta only five years ago was repulsed by the nation and banished, for a policy which is still admired by some, and which no doubt was full of audacity, but which, whatever else it may have been, was not the policy of prudence or sagacity. The patriot who talked and acted with the patriotism of sense at that sombre hour in the fortunes of France was M. Thiers, and at the last elections it was he who was placed in the triumphant position that to-day has been given to M. Gambetta. With the rapid versatility of true political greatness, M. Gambetta perceived what the fault of the revolutionary parties had been. They had for eighty years been dashing themselves against the nature of things, against the instincts of the people, against the whole set of conditions of social transformation, just as he himself had been dashing legion after legion in sterile conflict against the invaders. It was a revelation of genius to him that intrepidity, devotion, social hope, patriotic fire, might after all go with feasible aims and a right consideration of the relations between political cause and political effect. He satisfied the craving for violence in his extreme followers by the vehemence of his declamation, the deep tones of his voice, the wildness of his gesture, and the fierce readiness with which he retaliated on an interrupter. But underneath, all has been cool, as the head of a man who leads French liberalism needs to be, but too seldom has been.

In his electioneering speeches Gambetta has passed many gibes upon those whom he calls the play-actors of parliamentarism; yet it must be confessed that he has himself shown a very tolerable mastery of the arts, devices, costumes, properties, and stage-business of the parliamentary scene. His distinction has been that he never counted all this for more than it was

worth. He always looked, as our great leaders in England from Pym down to Chatham, and from Chatham's son down to Bright have looked, beyond the walls of the chamber out on to the forces of the country, its necessities, its sentiments, its prejudices, its hopes. He said at Belleville (Feb. 15) :

"Je suis d'une école qui ne croit qu'au relatif, à l'analyse, à l'observation, à l'étude des faits, au rapprochement et à la combinaison des idées ; d'une école qui tient compte des milieux, des races, des tendances, des préjugés et des hostilités, car il faut tenir compte de tout : les paradoxes, les sophismes pèsent autant que les vérités et que les généralités dans la conduite des hommes et des choses qui les intéressent. Aussi n'est-on un homme politique qu'à la condition de ne pas s'abandonner à des combinaisons de couloirs, à de misérables intrigues, à des personnalités qu'il faut laisser aux docteurs du parlementarisme."

In the same speech he won loud plaudits by the energy with which he set forth the following thrice and four times sound doctrine :

"Il ne faut jamais se payer de mots ni de phrases. Il ne faut jamais croire qu'on a la force quand on ne l'a pas. Il ne faut jamais croire qu'on est la majorité quand on ne l'est pas ; il ne faut jamais croire que tout est facile quand tout est presque irréalisable. Il faut être plus viril, plus exact, plus consciencieux, savoir résolument se placer en face de la réalité des choses, dresser le compte de toutes les difficultés, ne plus se payer d'illusions, ne se laisser abattre par aucun obstacle, poursuivre la tâche à remplir, le but à atteindre. Il faut marquer, regarder ses adversaires en face, et leur livrer bataille sous le regard de l'opinion publique."

This may seem very elementary truth to a nation of wide and fairly successful political experience like ourselves, but to the people of Belleville who have been taught for eighty years by their chiefs to pay themselves with words and illusions, to defy facts, and to perish under difficulties which they would rather perish under than admit, such sense as this, from a man who struck their imagination before he appealed to their reason, is like manna from heaven. It is incredible that the reactionary party in France and their unreflecting friends in the English press should be so blind and so unjust as not to see that the one hope for the stability of a government is that it shall be inspired by a man, whether Gambetta or another, who will use his power and influence to stimulate the political manliness and political conscientiousness of these vast masses of men whom former leaders made mad with empty phrases and futile passion.

There is another revolutionary delusion to which the new liberal chief will give no countenance nor question. From 1789 down to the last days of the Assembly of 1871, French politicians have had an undying faith in the absolute efficacy of laws, decrees, and ordinances ; in the immediate, indubitable, and permanent fulfilment of the objects at which such laws and ordinances were directed. Think, then, of the orator being interrupted for some minutes by the acclamations of his audience as he was speaking in such a vein as this :—

"Eh bien, la politique qui a préparé les résultats déjà obtenus est la seule qui puisse en poursuivre les fruits, la seule qui puisse déjouer les

pièges nombreux qui nous seront tendus par une réaction qui n'a plus d'espérance que dans nos défaillances et nos fautes. C'est maintenant qu'il faudra se surveiller soi-même, se régler et ne jamais aventurer un pas sans avoir bien reconnu la solidité du terrain, sans avoir assuré ses derrières, parce que le seul moyen d'aller loin c'est de marcher sûrement, étant bien résolu à ne jamais revenir en arrière quand une fois nous aurons planté notre drapeau sur une position conquise. Cette politique, qui est la politique des résultats, est la seule qui soit véritablement conforme aux intérêts de la démocratie, car ce que je veux, moi, pour la démocratie de mon pays, pour la France qu'elle est appelée à refaire, ce n'est pas une collection de décrets qu'on insère au *Moniteur* un jour et que la réaction déchire le lendemain. Ce que je veux, c'est que l'égalité ne soit pas un vain mot, c'est que l'éducation promise au peuple lui soit donnée, non pas par des affiches, par des ordonnances mises sur un mur, mais assurée par des faits et des actes : par des écoles ouvertes par des maîtres en chair et en os, par des livres bien faits, par des programmes d'éducation, par des élèves qu'on fera entrer et asseoir sur les mêmes bancs, sans distinction de classe et de conditions, et par un ensemble de moyens pratiques et financiers qui fassent de la réforme que nous attendons non pas de simples formules, des vœux stériles, mais une réalité palpable et tangible, une action incessante qui descendra jusque sur le dernier d'entre nous, jusque dans les bas-fonds de la société, pour y porter l'air, la lumière et l'intelligence."

No wonder that the organs of the Irreconcilable section,—a section of excellent aspirations, very self-denying, very honourable, but without a method, and without either political science or political art—no wonder that they should cry out with an exceeding bitter cry against the "Policy of the Relative"—that they should accuse its author of murdering "l'idéal, la pensée, l'absolu, le sentiment." They compare Gambetta to Henry IV. with much bitter irony—an irony and a comparison that tell in literature, but in the heat of a deadly battle with such a foe as Imperialism are naught. Here is a sample :—

"Quant à ceux qui se firent martyriser pour leur foi, c'étaient autant de rêveurs et de niais, qui ne considéraient que la nécessité du moment ; s'ils avaient eu plus de sens et de jugement, ils eussent été faire un petit tour à l'étranger, et, la guerre civile apaisée suite de combattants, ils fussent revenus assurer le triomphe de Henri IV, qui, lui aussi, était partisan de la politique relative, et qui mit la réforme sur le trône en se déclarant catholique, absolument comme M. Gambetta proclame la République en cessant d'être républicain. La Réforme, mise sur le trône par Henri IV, a abouti au despotisme catholique de Louis XIV. Rien ne démontre absolument que le triomphe de la République n'obtienne pas un couronnement analogue." —(*Droits de l'Homme*. Feb. 21.)

What distinguishes the large and keen vision of M. Gambetta from the narrow vision of M. Buffet is that the latter has been sent into a panic by writers of this temper, while the former has seen that such a temper is not deep in the nation and not deep even in Paris, and has seen how to meet and transform it. His victory over M. Nacquet at such a town as Marseilles is one of the many striking proofs of the soundness of his calculations. It

would be childish for us to subside into the assurance that the Irreconcilable section will never again raise its head. Where things hang on a single life, it is impossible to be sure that there will not be either a monarchic restoration or an anarchic conflagration. All we can know for certain is that M. Gambetta has triumphed over greater difficulties than he is ever likely to have to face again, and that he has persuaded France that a man may be a republican, may repudiate theology (witness his speech at the funeral of Edgar Quinet), may promise war against the Church on a far more effective plan than Dr. Falk's, may be the representative and the hero of Belleville, and yet and after all may be the leader of a rational and practical party, and may be trusted to keep 'moral order' better than a sinister bigot like M. Buffet.

It is worth while to realise in actual detail what lines the policy of the most energetic portion of the French liberals is likely to follow. What does M. Gambetta's republicanism mean? What is the practical outcome of it? On what side will it first make itself felt? M. Gambetta's speech at Bordeaux (Jan. 13) answers all such questions about his programme.

"Ce programme, il faut le dire et le répéter, est très-mesuré, très-sage. Je ne dis plus, je me garde de dire que vos représentants l'accompliront pendant leurs quatre années de législature; je ne le crois pas, et, si vous voulez toute ma pensée, je ne le veux pas! Si on pouvait seulement s'attacher à une partie du programme et la réaliser, non pas dans un vœu platonique, non pas dans une formule légale, mais dans l'exécution patiente et attentive, et dans le détail de l'administration générale du pays, je m'estimerais suffisamment heureux, et je dirais que les quatre années de législature qui vont s'ouvrir auraient été sagement employées pour le bien du pays. Je prends un seul article de ce programme, celui relatif à l'éducation nationale. C'est là qu'il faut toujours en revenir. . . . C'était le cri que nous poussions au lendemain de nos désastres: nous reconnaissons très-bien que, ce n'était pas seulement la force matérielle qui nous avait vaincus, mais que dans les combinaisons, dans les perfectionnements apportés à l'art de la guerre et aux mille détails qu'elle comporte, la supériorité de l'instruction avait donné l'avantage à nos ennemis, parce que, sur les champs de bataille, comme dans le champ de l'industrie, c'est la force d'esprit qui décide de la victoire. Nous avons réclamé alors ce que je réclame aujourd'hui; c'était le cri unanime, sortant de toutes les poitrines: la Réforme de l'Education Nationale; mais nous n'avons rien obtenu; nous n'avons rien pu arracher; je me trompe, on a obtenu contre nous une loi de division, une loi de recul, une loi de haine, une loi désorganisatrice, une loi d'anarchie morale pour la société française: je veux parler de la loi sur l'enseignement supérieur. Eh bien! messieurs, sans entrer dans les développements que comporterait un si immense sujet, je dis que la tâche urgente, pratique et efficace de vos futurs mandataires doit être presque uniquement celle de l'organisation, à tous les degrés, au point de vue des écoles, au point de vue des programmes, au point de vue des moyens d'étude, au point de vue financier, doit être d'assurer la constitution de l'éducation nationale; et si nous voulons véritablement aborder une telle réforme, il n'y en aurait pas d'autre qui dût venir se jeter au travers,

parce que les autres peuvent attendre ou peuvent être résolues plus promptement, et qu'elles ne seront même efficaces que quand celle-là aura réellement fonctionné. Donc, dans la discussion de vos idées, quand vous les soumettrez, s'il y a lieu, à vos candidats, attachez-vous à être précis, à ne jamais aborder une question avant une autre, à établir une véritable série mathématique, logique, scientifique, dans les revendications que vous voulez faire prévaloir : demandez d'abord à vos députés d'assurer l'éducation ; le reste, soyez-en convaincus, vous sera donné par surcroît."

This will sound painfully tame to people who have been made drunk by eighty years of utopian potions. The new feature in the present situation is that French liberalism has at length found a leader with true courage. It requires far more courage to talk in this strain, than to denounce tyrants, to promise the millennium, and to march to the guillotine with serenity on the brow and a magnanimous phrase on the lips. Such a policy brings the French revolutionary party into line with the rest of European liberalism, and the momentum which such an accession must add will be immense. For a quarter of a century France has shut herself out from the good cause in Europe. There is now for the first time since 1850 reasonable ground for hoping that her forces will count on the side of progress. France may not contribute many novel ideas in the region of practical politics. Her politicians have much to learn both from England and from America before they can solve their two great problems—not to mention others—of national instruction and administrative decentralisation. Until they have a free press and the free right of meeting, they cannot be considered the chiefs of a really free and self-governing people. But even in the meantime, it will be an immense gain to liberals who are fighting the battle in more prosaic lands to have their principles advocated with the elevation, the dignity of phrase, the high social morality, and above all the strong sympathy for the common people, as profound as it is rational, with which M. Gambetta's recent speeches have surrounded the accepted doctrines of Liberalism all over the western world.

The opening of another session of parliament reminds us among other things how few of our own Liberal chiefs possess the art in which M. Gambetta has shown himself supreme, of making common sense eloquent and inspiring. Parliamentary discussion has been more than usually level. Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Lowe made vigorous speeches on the subject of the purchase of the Suez Canal, but the general impression left on the public mind is, that although if they had bought the shares they would certainly have done so in a more careful and business-like way, still that they would never have bought them at all. The Government have introduced a Merchant Shipping Bill which only half satisfies the extreme believers in the efficacy of legislative interference ; and a Bill for the Enclosure of Commons which thoroughly dissatisfies all who are solicitous for the maintenance of popular rights in popular property. The House of Lords by another Government Bill, is to retain the shadow of its name as the court of final appeal. But, when constituted as such a court, it is only to consist of a certain number of professional lawyers, and it is also to receive two Lords.

of Appeal, who will be to all intents and purposes life peers. How far this arrangement promotes or serves the dignity of the Upper House, its members may judge for themselves. To the public, provided a step has been taken in the direction of a better constituted judiciary, that kind of dignity which is consulted by the retention of the shadow while parting with the substance, is an object of minor interest.

A subject to which more popular attention has been attracted is the proposal to add to the style of the Sovereign some phrase that shall designate her empire in India. India moves incessantly like some swarthy phantom in the background of our politics. It sometimes advances, sometimes recedes, sometimes stands motionless, but it is always there and its presence is always felt like a portentous shadow. Just now in the eye of popular interest the shadow moves. Mr. Disraeli's bold figure of the chain of fortresses that connect India with the very gates of England, was a more effective way of enabling people to realise our relations to India, than the price which they will have to pay for the last acquired link of the chain that is not a fortress. A new Viceroy is going out, attended by the good wishes of the country and the warm hopes of a troop of friends. The country is interested in the experiment of a ruler over India whose mental habits have been formed among the more varied, flexible, imaginative conditions of continental life and continental diplomacy. The peril of the narrowly absolute and insular type was shown in the mischievous blunder of Lord Lytton's predecessor at Baroda.

A great accountant may be a great man, but he is certainly not always a statesman, and even for the adjustment of fiscal questions, imagination, pliancy, and varied intellectual resource may in certain circumstances do far more valuable work in such a country as India, than the most laborious devotion to the methods of the counting-house. Lord Northbrook has held office for four years. As to his career, in the absence of more than one known occasion for blame, or any marked occasion for praise, the disposition of the English press at present rather turns to eulogy. The eulogy is necessarily vague, because it springs from no full knowledge of the facts. Only the experts can form a really sound opinion, and the experts think less favourably of the retiring Viceroy's achievements. Lord Northbrook has been in India what he was when in office in England, a most careful and industrious administrator. This has perhaps not proved to be quite enough. Lord Northbrook went to India with the idea that the country had been over-governed, and he resolved to pursue a policy of rest and inaction. Contrasted with the energetic and progressive conduct of his predecessor, Lord Northbrook's may be called a policy not merely of inaction but of reaction. With a perfect confidence in his own clear judgment and power of mastering details, he is said to have undertaken to administer single-handed the affairs of a continent almost as large as Europe, though he was necessarily ignorant of its infinite variety of conditions and requirements. The Bengal Famine was the first rough interruption. Its gravity was no doubt much exaggerated; still it was of sufficient magnitude to call out some of the highest powers of statesmanship, both in dealing with the immediate problem, and in framing measures to meet an Indian difficulty of

constant recurrence and ever-increasing perplexity. The main idea of Lord Northbrook's 'famine policy,' if it was statesmanlike, was certainly of a singular simplicity. People are starving; starving people must have food; spend as many millions in buying food as will give plenty to as many mouths as you think fit. It is true that this policy is said to have been urged on Lord Northbrook by the Cabinet at home, as it certainly was urged upon him with the utmost vehemence by the press—a plea, by the way, that does not apply to Lord Northbrook's mischievous perversity in the affair of the Guikwar. And it is true that to Lord Northbrook's excellent qualifications as a man of business we may fairly set down the complete success in detail of the operations for the supply of food; and they were carried out on an enormous scale and in the face of enormous difficulties. But when we talk of statesmanship and policy, we are thinking of a man who is able to judge rightly for himself, for one thing, and who looks to the future, for another thing. Now there has been no evidence that any effective thought was given to the permanent burden that has been laid on the country by the profuse expenditure of 6½ millions within a few months in providing mere temporary relief. No man can measure the financial difficulties that must arise if every season of drought is to be accompanied by this immense and unproductive outlay. Here we have to face the central difficulty of the Indian situation—how to govern an immense, distant, unfamiliar dependency, by a democracy, with Exeter Hall, with a House of Commons containing a fully representative quota of fools, and a press that alternates as to subject races between silly philanthropy and bloodthirsty iniquity. "In the case of India," Mr. Mill said, "a politically active people like the English, amidst habitual acquiescence are every now and then interfering, and almost always in the wrong place. The real causes which determine the prosperity or wretchedness, the improvement or deterioration, of the Hindoos, are too far off to be within their ken. They have not the knowledge necessary for suspecting the existence of these causes, much less for judging of their operation. The most essential interests of the country may be well administered without obtaining any of their approbation, or mismanaged to almost any extent without attracting their notice." This is every day seen to be perfectly true. It is very easy for patriots at Westminster to groan at Mr. Lowe for talking of our having to give up India one day, but if the famine policy for which Lord Northbrook has been so much praised is to be systematically repeated, how is financial ruin to be avoided? For we have to remember that a constantly accumulating burden of debt in India is accompanied by no corresponding development of productive resources; and such a burden may before long readily become a source of even greater difficulty to the government and greater misery to the people, than the very distress which we designed to remedy.

Lord Northbrook's financial policy has on the whole been extremely careful and economical. But here too there has probably been a too exclusive attention to the wants of the immediate present. Some of his latest acts in connection with the customs tariff are before long likely to give rise to sharp criticism. In India the fiscal system is extremely rudimentary. The

land revenue is the only branch of the public income which can properly be said to be based on the wealth of the country, or to be susceptible of development with the increase of public wealth. On the other hand the wants of advancing civilisation are infinite. Looking beyond the mere present, it is impossible not to see that many and serious changes must be made, to place the finances on a really sound basis, and to bring the revenues into the requisite relation with the various sources of public wealth. And the problem is complicated by the strong political pressure by which the Lancashire manufacturers are able to back their protests against at least one profitable item in the Indian tariff. Neither the difficult questions on the North West frontier, nor the difficult questions connected with the native armies, will give the new Viceroy so many sleepless nights and harassing days as the prodigious enigma of Indian finance.

Some elections have taken place, and are worth noticing. Those in the counties have been of various meaning. Take East Suffolk, for instance, where no liberal has sat for forty years. A clergyman who has had a benefice in an eastern county for nearly forty years recently described the deterioration of public life in those parts to the present writer. "The county people," he said, "are withdrawing more and more from political affairs and from everything else except hunting and battues. They don't go into the army, because they fear the examinations. They don't go to India for the same reason. They don't go into electioneering, because they dislike the roughness of it and the necessity of conciliating people whom they regard as dependents." Probably the same is true of other parts of England besides Suffolk. Whether it be true or not that the old possessors of power are becoming indifferent to it, that will not much longer be the case with the new possessors of power.

The success of the tenant farmers in North Shropshire, their revolt in Dorsetshire, the resignation of Mr. Clare Read, are all so many signs that the class which has the election of county members in its hands is beginning to awake. Discontent, accompanied by the growing consciousness of power, is certain to spread very rapidly. The landlords of both parties can no longer count upon the 'fine brute votes' of their tenants. The farmers have hitherto been, and still are in name, Tories almost to a man. They have been devoted followers of the landed gentry, staunch adherents of the Established Church, and bitter opponents of National Education. They have considered the town radicals their natural enemies. They have consistently opposed every proposition which has emanated from the hostile ranks. But if it be once made clear to them that the objects which they are beginning earnestly to desire will have the hearty support of those whom they chose to take for born foes, the whole fabric of their Toryism will receive a shock, and we may yet see Radicals returned to Parliament for English counties in defiance alike of Whig and Tory landlords. The Conservatism of the farmers is based on the supposed interests of the land. Their views on ecclesiastical questions are less the expression of strong and intelligent conviction, than a kind of political log-rolling, by which the various vested interests of the country ally themselves together

for mutual protection. When it is recognised that this alliance has ceased to be mutually advantageous, the tacit compact will be at an end, and new combinations will take its place. When that happens, then those who are best acquainted with the slow workings of the bucolic mind, are tolerably sure that not even the desire to secure the continued presence of 'a cultivated gentleman in every parish,' will be suffered to over-ride more material interests.

It would be premature to count these possibilities as immediately probable. A certain section of the liberals, who have for a long time excused their unwillingness to set the political machinery in motion by interest in its further perfection, declare their anxiety to make the extension of Household Suffrage to the Counties the first object of the whole party. If they succeed, all hopes of an alliance with the farmers may be abandoned. The concession of a share of political power to the agricultural labourers has for their employers all the terrors of the Red Spectre in France. If it be made the first point in a revival of liberal activity, they will give up their hopes of Tenant Right and County boards sooner than accept it. Their prejudice on the subject does not make the extension of the franchise less just or less certain. But it is a fact which may well be taken into consideration by the liberal leaders, whenever they set themselves seriously to determine the order of precedence of the reforms which our generation has to accomplish.

If we turn from the counties to the boroughs, we find that the elections are disclosing the fact which some of us were wholly prepared for, that the thoroughgoing Liberal is gradually edging out the over-cautious Liberal. The great law of Survival of the politically Fittest is operating in the extinction of the timid Whig and the rise of a stronger breed. At Leominster a candidate has been elected who is of the very boldest school of liberalism, and this in the face of a very strong Conservative opponent. The significant circumstance about this election is that the canvassers directed the whole of their efforts to convincing the electors that absolute secrecy was secured. Hitherto the tenants and small people have been very doubtful of this. There is little doubt that 200 voters promised the Tories and then balloted for the Liberal. Immoral enough; but not really more so than the pressure exerted by the other side. And fortunately the new form of immorality will put an end to the old form, and then both will vanish together. At any rate, there is the fact for politicians to take to heart, that the Ballot is winning confidence as a means of really secret voting. At Burnley the successful candidate was chosen by the local liberal leaders in preference to another liberal aspirant, because the latter was of too mild a shade. At Manchester the so-called moderates were anxious to fight the battle not with Mr. Bright, but with Mr. Hibbert. They were overruled, and they now admit that none but an advanced candidate will henceforth be able to rouse the spirit of the effective sections of the party. We do not in the least incline to overrate the significance of these elections in measuring the relative strength of Liberals and Conservatives. That such a candidate as Mr. Powell should secure so solid a vote in a city like Manchester is a warning, along with a hundred other signs, that we are still a long way from the end of the Con-

spirit and intelligence, whether the function of officership shall be performed by them, or by a selfish and low-minded class of professional politicians.

So far as legislation goes, there is only one way of attracting the best members of the middle class into some more effective participation in public business than occasional attendance at a caucus for choosing a parliamentary candidate. This way is to make local governing bodies more important. The more interesting and important the functions of an assembly, the better the quality of the intelligence that is likely to come to it. One reason why the House of Representatives at Washington has so small a share of the best men in the country, compared even with our House of Commons, is that its business is so much less important to America than the business of the House of Commons is to England. The State legislatures pre-occupy an immense department of governmental action, and they do their work as a rule intelligently enough. With us, there will be plenty of important work left for the central Parliament, after there has been an increase of the attributions of the local parliaments. At present, there is no unwillingness in the legislature to remit questions to be decided by local authorities. But then parliament seems half afraid of its own policy, and its conception of permissive legislation, wholesome as it is in one respect, is extremely weak and vicious in another. The true principle of all legislation of this kind is to leave to local bodies no alternative in the application of a given measure, but the widest possible discretion in the manner of its administration. Again, one of the most excellent steps for the improvement of local bodies would be to concentrate in one of them the functions that are now dispersed among several. The Town Council performs one set of duties, the Board of Guardians another set, the School Board a third, the Licensing Magistrates a fourth, the Governors of an Endowed School a fifth. There may possibly have been good reasons for this dispersion of offices, when they were first devised. It is hard to see what reasons are now to be urged against their union in a single local parliament, a representative body with powers for all the local purposes of the neighbourhood. At present, though the Council of a great town may in a single year authorise the expenditure of as large a sum as the government of the country has given for half of the Suez Canal, yet the work of the Council of an ordinary corporation hardly exceeds the business of a small contractor. If you added to this the work of the School Board, another set of persons would be interested in watching its proceedings; the administration of the Poor Laws would attract others; the control of the public-houses, and the administration of any local endowments, would do the same. In a body of this kind, among its many other advantages, we could count upon finding feeling enough for good government and the public weal, to counterbalance that penuriousness of the smaller rate-payer which is so natural considering his circumstances, and yet is so threatening an impediment in the way of social improvement.

February 25, 1876.

THE . . .
FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

NO. CXII. NEW SERIES.—APRIL 1, 1876.

SPIRITUALISM AND MATERIALISM.

PART I.

“Die theoretischen Irrthümer meist mehr darauf beruhen dass man die Erklärungsgründe aus andern Gebiete der Naturwissenschaften übertragend auf den Organismus anwandte.”—JOHANNES MÜLLER, *Ueber die phantastischen Gesichterscheinungen*, 1826, p. 3.

ALTHOUGH the controversy between the two conceptions of the world, known as Spiritualism and Materialism, still rages, and is likely to rage for many years, the conceptions themselves are incessantly being modified, and approaching nearer and nearer to a common agreement, as each party recognises what is strong in the positions of its adversary. While the spiritualist has been forced by the advances of physiological science to assign a larger and larger place to the operation of material conditions in the production of mental phenomena, the materialist has been forced by the same advance of science to recognise the existence of conditions entirely different from those classed as material. But there is still on the one side the terrified repugnance at whatever bears the name of Matter, and on the other the contemptuous rejection of whatever claims the character of Spirit. There is still the radical separation between the conceptions of Creation and Evolution in the explanation of the Cosmos; and between the conceptions of *metaphysiology*, and physiology in the explanation of Life and Mind. Standing apart from these contending schools, there is a third school, small indeed, but important, which rejects the theories of both, or rather which disengages what seems valid in each, and by a new interpretation reconciles their differences.

I do not propose here to discuss the Cosmic question, but will merely note in passing that modern philosophy has completely revolutionised it by showing that the broadest of all distinctions—that of Object and Subject, or of Matter and Mind—does not demand a corresponding opposition in their substrata, but simply the logical

distinction of aspects : so that one and the same group of phenomena is objectively expressible in terms of Matter and Motion, and subjectively in terms of Feeling. Matter ceases to be an alien, ceases to have the dead unspiritual character, when we learn that everything we can possibly know of it is one of the many modes of Feeling. All our knowledge of it is our knowledge of our own affections. Our inferences respecting it as Notself are but the hypothetical representations of the possible modes of Feeling which the Notself would excite in us under conceivable changes of relation. Having classed experiences and inferences under the general heads of Matter and Motion, and thus formed conceptions of objects and forces, we endeavour to range the unclassified modes under similar rubrics, and thus explain the occurrence of some given change of Feeling by the conjunction of other modes, known and inferred. For example, we say that the change named Colour is the effect of a conjunction of the specific pulsations of an undulating medium on a specific nerve-terminal, followed by a specific excitation in a nerve centre. In one aspect this process is from first to last a material process—*i.e.* an objective process. But in another aspect it is equally a mental or subjective process. Ideally, and for our convenience, we dissociate the objective from the subjective aspect ; but when we suppose that a real separation corresponds with this ideal distinction, we are thrown back upon the mystery of how a material process can become a mental process, how vibrations become sensations. The mystery is an illusion. There is no such transformation. What is called the material process is simply the objective aspect of the subjective mental process. Examine the material terms “vibration,” “external medium,” “impinging,” “nerve-terminal,” “nerve-centre,” and “excitation,” they are one and all translatable in terms of Feeling ; and only thus are they significant : every sensible having its corresponding sensation. Strip the objective terms of all their subjective values, and you leave them as the unknown *x*. But in saying that Matter cannot be dissociated from Mind, we are not relinquishing our belief in the Reality which is not ourselves ; we are only affirming that the perceptions and conceptions which Philosophy employs as its materials in the construction of theories, are under one aspect material—*i.e.* objective—under another aspect mental—*i.e.* subjective ; and that the business of the philosopher is to systematize the conceptions, and recognise the logical distinction of their aspects.

In systematizing the conceptions respecting the organism and its actions, we must hold fast to the teachings of Experience ; and all our inferences which transcend or run before actual sensation, must be modelled on Experience. Now it is a fact of Experience that Feeling and Thought stand in such direct contrast with Matter

and Force—the symbols represent concretes so markedly unlike—that there is the greatest difficulty in recognising identity of existence under such diversity of aspect. Starting from this fact of difference, the spiritualist hypothesis invokes a corresponding diversity in the substrata: it postulates the existence of a spiritual entity which is *in* the material organism but not *of* it; somewhat as the dwarf was inside Kempelen's automaton chessplayer. The body it regards as a machine which is set going by a machinist who watches and regulates its movements. This machinist has been variously conceived as Vital Principle, or Soul; although directly known through consciousness, it is nevertheless an inscrutable mystery, and its mode of operation in determining organic movements can never be detected. The materialist hypothesis of molecular movements becoming transformed into Feeling is not simply repugnant, it is inconceivable—the gulf between Motion and Feeling being unbridgeable. Nay, does not the materialist himself proclaim the passage to be an insoluble mystery?

So long as the old Dualism of Matter and Mind is not resolved into the dual aspect of objective and subjective, the intellectual difficulty here emphasised will sustain the spiritualist hypothesis. And to this intellectual repugnance there is added a moral repugnance. Many who reject the hypothesis of a Vital Principle as a scientific encumbrance, thwarting instead of aiding research, cling to the equivalent hypothesis of a Psychical Principle, not only as an aid but as a sanction. With an honourable though unwise dread of losing in this hypothesis a great sanction of Morality, they cling to it in the face of evidence, and prefer the ignorance which offers the sanction a basis, to any knowledge which threatens its acceptance. Could they once see that after all Materialism is only an hypothesis, and one which, whether true or false, can in no way alter the facts it is invented to link together, they would admit that while their repugnance may be rational on the intellectual side, it is irrational on the moral side. Our moral life has, happily, no such insecure basis as that of a speculative conception. Nor would the existence of a spiritual Principle, could it be demonstrated, help us to understand, and understanding modify, the facts of moral life. A superficial observation suffices to show how incapable such a Principle must be of generating moral conduct; since so many souls exhibit a deplorable insensibility to moral duties. Every one acquainted with prisons and lunatic asylums knows that there are beings in whom what is called the "moral sense" is irremediably deficient. Nor is this observation impugned by referring to the effect of bad Education; since such an argument implies that Morality depends more on Education than on the Psychical Principle. And if it be said that criminals and cretins are what we see because of their "defec-

tive organizations," this also implies that the organization, and not the Principle, is the basis of moral life, and that to it our study must be directed.¹

Before proceeding to examine the validity of either the spiritualist or the materialist hypothesis, let me beg the reader to clear his mind, if possible, of the irrelevant considerations which have been suffered to crowd round and obscure the question. The spiritualist, it is notorious, claims for his hypothesis the consecration of "our holiest instincts and our loftiest aspirations"—a claim which may well excite sympathy and hope, and place antagonists at a disadvantage; but on investigation the claim turns out to be a preposterous assumption. He relies on it to stigmatize all opposition as false, because degrading: not, be it observed, degrading because false! He relies on it to proclaim that opponents deny all the spiritual facts, deny moral responsibility, disinterestedness, and ideal aims. On this ground he considers no words too vituperative to be flung at those who criticize his hypothesis; no conclusions too absurd to be attributed to his opponents. Thus for years Materialism has been a term of reproach; and most men have been eager to disavow their sympathy with an opinion at once so "shallow" and so "despicable."

Self-laudation and abuse of antagonists are rhetorical devices which one cannot hope to see disused—in our days at least. But the rhetoric of many spiritualists is very distasteful to serious minds, aware that the materialist no more denies the facts of Conscience, in discrediting the hypothesis of their being the products of a spirit, than the Berkleyan, in rejecting the ordinary hypothesis of an external Matter, denies the facts of Existence. We have no more right to expect that the materialist will run counter to moral obligations, than that the idealist will run his head against the lamp-post; although both these preposterous conclusions have been gravely "deduced" by opponents.

Both Spiritualism and Materialism have much that is plausible, and much that is defective. Each successfully links together certain important facts, and fixes attention on fundamental points. But each commits the common sin against Scientific Method of overlooking the artificial nature of Analysis; and thus assigns to a single factor the product which obviously results from many. Each is misled by the desire to find one simple cause for a complex effect; which is in flagrant disregard of the fundamental principle of causation. Moreover each is open to the charge of incomplete observation. Inferences are allowed to take the place of facts; and facts

(1) In saying this I am confining the question within the limits of the individual organization, without reference to the social medium in which that organization lives, and from which so large a part of the moral life arises.

which cannot be explained by the hypothesis are left out of sight. The spiritualist relies upon an inference which no observation ever could verify—the existence of a spirit; and the materialists rely on inferences which no observation ever did verify—the existence of “vital properties” in electricity, or of thought as “a property inherent in brain-substance.”

It is probable that some readers will dissent from the assertion that both hypotheses have much in their favour; but that dissent will vanish if they consider how eminent have been the upholders of each. It is never wise to assume that an antagonist is a fool merely because he holds what seems to us a foolish opinion. It is not foolish to him; and we should do well to understand how this is so. To refute an opinion we must understand it; and we cannot understand the aspect it presents to his mind unless we place ourselves at his standpoint. If from that point we can see what he sees, and see more, we may hope to enlarge his vision; never by denying what he sees.

Although my tone of thought is profoundly opposed to that of Spiritualism, I can conscientiously say that no effort has been wanting on my part to seek out its strongest arguments in the works of all the great teachers. Indeed there was one brief period when I was very near a conversion. The idea of a noumenal Mind, as something distinct from mental phenomena—a something diffused through the organism giving unity to Consciousness, very different from the unity of a machine, flashed upon me one morning with a sudden and novel force, quite unlike the shadowy vagueness with which it had heretofore been conceived. For some minutes I was motionless in a rapt state of thrilled surprise. I seemed standing at the entrance of a new path, leading to new issues with a vast horizon. The convictions of a life seemed tottering. A tremulous eagerness, suffused with the keen delight of discovery, yet mingled with cross-lights and hesitations, stirred me; and from that moment I have understood something of sudden conversions. There was, as I afterwards remembered, no feeling of distress at this prospect of parting with old beliefs. Indeed it is doubtful whether sudden conversions are accompanied by pain, the excitement is too great, the new ideas too absorbing. The rapture of truth overcomes the false shame of having been in error. The one desire is for more light.

The intense and prolonged meditation which followed, affected my health. I re-read the writings of the great thinkers on the spiritualist side, doing my utmost to keep in abeyance the old objections and hesitations which continually surged up, and trying to keep my mind open to all the force of argument which could be urged. But the light flickered as I moved. The old trains of thought would recur, with the physiological evidence which could not be disputed. Instead of gaining

conviction from the writings of metaphysicians, the more I studied them, the more the darkness gathered; till finally I returned to my starting-point, and began to re-examine it. This was the result: I saw that the distinction between a noumenal Mind and mental phenomena was a purely logical distinction transformed into a real distinction; it was the separation of an abstraction from its concretes, such as we make when we separate the abstraction substance from concrete qualities, and this separation, effected logically, we erect into a real distinction by substantialising the abstraction, which is then supposed to precede and produce the concretes from which it is raised. The noumenal Mind had thus no more warrant than a Machine Principle apart from all machines, or a Vital Principle apart from vital phenomena.

Although the spiritualist hypothesis had thus again lost all plausibility for me, I had gained at least the conviction that its persistence in the face of advancing science, and its acceptance by minds of great power, was not without justification as a protest against mechanical conceptions, and an insistence on the need of a synthetic explanation. I felt, as I had never fully felt before, its value as a reaction against the too-confident and precipitate attempts to reduce vital and mental phenomena to physical and chemical laws, without due regard to the speciality of conditions which characterize organic phenomena. Henceforward I could sympathize with the spiritualist in his belief that Life and Mind are of a quite different order from anything seen in the heavens, or in the laboratory—an order seen only in the organic series. But this made me more anxious to ascertain wherein the difference began—the speciality of the conditions which the organic series involved. And here I could not take a step with the spiritualist when he sought a cause lying outside the organism, and propounded an hypothesis which by its very terms transcended all verification. There was no illumination from the rebaptism of the observed phenomena, under the terms Vital Principle, Soul, and Spirit. Nor did the more serious spiritualists profess to know what this transcendental agent really was, they only held fast to the assertion that it was not Matter. And while they were satisfied to proclaim it the unknown cause of the known effects (in accordance with the false though generally accepted notion of causation)—most of them were willing to declare an equal ignorance in regard to Matter. Thus thinkers so various as Voltaire, Condillac, Hume, Kant, Reid, and Hamilton declared their impartial ignorance of Mind and Matter, while affirming confidently that Mind could have no community with Matter. Clearly there was some deep-seated ambiguity in the terms thus used.

The ambiguity appears directly the question descends to particulars. It is a common tendency of disputants to caricature the opinions they

oppose, and thus appear to gain an easy triumph over an adversary shown in an absurd light. The spiritualist presents his adversary as holding that Life and Mind are "manifestations of ordinary Matter—" by which is meant that Life is manifested by inert, lifeless earths, crystals, or gases; and Mind by "blind unconscious Matter." But although materialists have much to answer for, they never talked nonsense like this. They never supposed that ordinary Matter lived and felt. They affirmed that only organized Matter lived, and only organized animals felt. Whatever incompleteness may belong to their conception of the material conditions involved, they had at least this manifest superiority, that they endeavoured to express the observed facts in terms of Experience, and refused to postulate an unknowable agent.

The real battle-ground is this: In seeking an explanation of the phenomena of Life and Mind, are we to construct it from the observed facts and known laws, filling up the gaps of observation by inferences which themselves have a sensible basis and admit of verification, so that hypotheses may conform to scientific canons, and represent sensible or extra-sensible Experience? or are we to pass beyond the sphere of possible observation, and invoke an agency which never was, never could be sensible, nor expressed in terms of Experience?

Those who choose the first alternative are classed as materialists; those who choose the latter are spiritualists. But here a further subdivision is necessary. As there are many opponents of Materialism, who, nevertheless, emphatically reject the hypothesis of a Spirit, replacing it by the substantialised abstraction of an Idea, or Plan; so likewise there are opponents of Spiritualism who reject the physico-chemical hypothesis of Life, and the hypothesis of Thought being the property of cerebral cells—they are to be distinguished from the materialists by their synthetic attitude, which embraces all the co-operant factors. These latter may be specially designated as organicists, since it is to the organism (with all that term involves) that they refer every organic phenomenon. Of course the various opinions on each side blend insensibly, so that one can seldom sharply define all the views of a particular thinker. But the two schools are broadly distinguishable as the extra-organic, and the organic, or as the metaphysiological, and the physiological. When I said just now that I rejected the materialist hypothesis, I referred of course to the imperfect form which the physiological interpretation often assumes; but in so far as Materialism is identified with the physiological interpretation, and rejects the *metaphysiological*, I heartily accept it.

THE METAPHYSIOLOGICAL HYPOTHESIS.

It will have been remarked, perhaps, that hitherto our remarks have blended Life and Soul interchangeably, although in some systems these are made two distinct Principles. Here the main interest lies in the question of Method; and in this respect whether Life be identified with, or separated from Mind, is quite unimportant.

The ancients believed the organism to be an inert machine animated by three Principles—the vegetative, sensitive, and rational souls. Aristotle and his followers reduced the three to one; but modern metaphysicians and physiologists have been staggered by the impropriety of assigning Secretion, Digestion, &c., to the spiritual agent active in Thought and Will;¹ they have been also impressed with the impropriety of assigning vital powers to lifeless Matter; and they have hoped to reconcile all difficulties by endowing the organism with two spiritual principles essentially distinct, one for vital, the other for mental processes. Only by the aid of extra-organic agents, said they, can the phenomena be intelligible, since physical and chemical processes fail to render them intelligible. Moreover, the unity of vital phenomena was said to claim imperiously “an unique principle, an unique cause of all organic functions, and even the formation of the organs themselves.”² This favourite argument has no validity. To demand an unique cause for Life, on the ground of the phenomena thus grouped in one expression, is to misconceive the nature of causation, and the nature of the complex effects. No one thinks of extending such an argument to the American Republic, or the German Nation, which are also unities.

Although now fallen into general discredit, Animism seems to me more logically consistent than Vitalism. If an extra-organic agent is to be postulated as the generator and regulator of organic phenomena, one such agent will suffice both for physiological and psychological processes; the more so since the psychological obviously arise from the physiological. But metaphysicians carrying out their analytical separations, and substantialising the results of such analysis, not only come to believe in the real distinction between Mind and Life, but also in the real distinction between the Action and the Agent; and this logical artifice thus endowed with reality leads to the postulate of an Animating Principle which is some-

(1) Here are two out of a multitude of passages which might be cited:—“*Je ne comprends pas qu'on puisse mettre un cataplasme sur l'âme; mon spiritualisme se révolte à l'idée que mon âme puisse être influencée par des hémorroïdes au rectum, ou bien par une rétention d'urine.*”—Amédée Latour, *Revue Médicale*, 31st August, 1860.

“*Une âme qui sécrète l'urine vous paraît-elle moins dégoûtante qu'un cerveau qui sécrète la pensée?*”—Pidoux, *De la nécessité du Spiritualisme pour régénérer les sciences médicales*, 1857, p. 70.

(2) Bouiller, *Du Principe Vital*, 1862, p. 4.

thing essentially different from the Organism.¹ It is on this path they have found more and more reasons for separating groups of phenomena, and after detaching the Life from the Body, have detached Mind from Sense, because Sense obviously involved bodily organs and material stimuli; and restricted Mind to Thought and Will, these seeming to be rescued from all participation in material conditions.²

Spiritualism, having thus rescued Thought and Will from every material implication, in proof of the position that it is the Soul which determines vital phenomena, urges the undisputed fact that Thought and Will exercise a marked influence on the bodily functions. The counter-argument is, however, more effective in its insistence on the not less indisputable fact that the bodily functions influence mental states—a fact which Spiritualism vainly tries to evade by declaring it to be a “mystery;” but which is more rationally interpretable as due to the interdependence of organic phenomena, among which Thought and Will take their place. When we observe doses of alcohol or morphia raising or depressing the mental activity, just as tightening or slackening a cord increases or decreases the rapidity of its vibrations—when we observe an arrested secretion deepening the gloom, or a fluttering of the heart awakening the fears,—when we observe that a suicidal tendency can be arrested by opium, returning whenever the opium is no longer given, it is idle to reject this evidence of the dependence of mental states on physiological conditions, and ask us to accept instead, the conclusion that the facts are mysterious. Mysterious perhaps; but the mystery proves no extra-organic agency.

Nor is there any real gain in placing the mystery in a Soul, which manifests itself through the vehicle of a Body, using the Body as a

(1) “I am visionary enough to imagine,” said Abernethy, “that if once philosophers saw reason to believe that life was something of an invisible and active nature superadded to organization, they would then see equal reason to believe that mind might be superadded to life, as life is to structure. They would then, indeed, still farther perceive how mind and matter might reciprocally operate on each other by means of an intervening substance.”—*Inquiry into the Probability and Rationality of Mr. Hunter's Theory of Life*, 1814, p. 94.

(2) Maine de Biran not only excludes all vital functions from the soul, or *le Moi*, but even Sensibility, with all the faculties dependent on it, “l'imagination, les reproductions ou associations fortuites d'images ou de signes, enfin tout ce qui se fait passivement ou nécessairement en nous.” (*Rapports du Physique et du Moral*). And enumerating elsewhere the rejected phenomena he says that whatever belongs to the organism belongs to the physical nature: “Des affections immédiates de plaisir ou de douleur; des attraites sympathiques ou des répugnances inhérentes au tempérament primitif ou confondus avec lui et devenus irrésistibles par l'habitude; des images qui se produisent spontanément dans l'organisme cérébral, et qui tantôt persistent opiniâtrément, tantôt se révoltent avec les paroxysmes de telles maladies ou désordres nerveux, les mouvements violents, brusques et précipités que ces passions entraînent, soit que le moi de l'homme étant absorbé n'y prenne aucune part, soit qu'il y assiste comme témoin, les appétits, les penchans, ces déterminations, ces idées qui suivent nécessairement la direction du physique, tout cela est hors du domaine moral.”—*Œuvres*, iii. 352; ed. Naville.

musician does his instrument, the imperfections of the instrument being perceptible in the music, but in nowise implicating the powers of the performer. No doubt, if there were any evidence for this hypothesis, such an interpretation would be accepted. But where is the evidence that the Body is only an instrument played upon by the Soul? There is absolutely none. It is brought forward in avowed ignorance of the causal connection. We have not on the one hand knowledge of the Spirit and its powers, on the other of the Body and its properties, comparable with our knowledge of the musician and the instrument, so that we can explain the action of the one on the other. All we positively know is the changes in the body; and because we do not understand how material changes can produce vital and mental phenomena, we assume the co-operation of something not material; the more so because Matter and Mind are mutually exclusive conceptions. But here again it is the ambiguity of terms which creates the difficulty. By a logical artifice we have isolated Matter from Mind—that is the Felt from Feeling—and having established this contrast, cannot recognise the artifice. That mental phenomena are not material phenomena, is asserted in the very terms which are employed. In the same sense chemical phenomena are not physical; nor vital phenomena chemical; nor moral phenomena mechanical; nor political phenomena domestic. But these necessary artificial distinctions expressed in language must be taken for what they are worth. They do not affect the reality of all phenomena whatever being changes of the Felt, when objectively viewed, and changes of Feeling, when subjectively viewed. The Matter, of which spiritualists speak so scornfully, is but an abstraction. Matter, the real, with which we have to deal, is saturated with Mind, since it is the Felt.

When we are told that “vital phenomena cannot be accounted for by any known laws” there is a similar ambiguity. True that they have not been sufficiently observed, analysed, and classified, to have disclosed their constants (laws) except in general outlines; it is true therefore, that existing knowledge of organic laws is insufficient to account for many vital phenomena. But this limitation, which every biologist acknowledges, is by the spiritualist turned into the assertion that the *known* laws of Matter being incompetent to explain the facts, *unknown* laws of Spirit alone can be competent. They might as well invoke unknown laws of Spirit to explain the at present inexplicable facts of Astronomy, Physics, and Chemistry. Barclay quotes a passage from the chemist Chaptal which lays the whole stress on the position that the “principle of life presents to us phenomena which chemistry never could have known or predicted by attending to the invariable laws observed in inanimate bodies.”¹

(1) Barclay, “Life and Organization,” 1822, p. 388.

This is true, but irrelevant. No chemical phenomena could be predicted by attending to the invariable laws observed in Astronomy; no meteorological phenomena could be predicted by attending to the laws of Optics and Acoustics. To predict phenomena we must take into view all their co-operant conditions. And it is because the materialist fails to take these into view that he hopes by Chemistry to explain phenomena that involve more than chemical conditions. But this error is not rectified by the spiritualist who seeks outside the organism for a principle superadded to the material conditions.

There is no force in the arguments respecting the impossibility of conceiving Matter endowed with vital properties, and the impossibility with our present resources of making organized substances. There is indeed a logical necessity to draw a broad line of demarcation between vital and chemical phenomena. But while we refuse to interpret organized Matter by the possibilities of ordinary Matter, we reject the suggestion that vitality is "an undiscovered form of force having no connection with primary energy or motion." (Beale.) Again and again we must say that there is absolutely no evidence for the existence of an extra-organic agent which is "temporarily associated with matter," and which "governs not only the present changes Matter is to undergo, but prepares it in advance for changes which are to occur at a future time." What is "temporarily associated with Matter"—if the metaphor be allowed—is not a force which is prescient of the future, not a force which is unallied with energy or motion, not a force which is something different from mass-acceleration, but a force which is the directed energy of a particular state of matter named organization. That vital phenomena depend on the changes in organized matter, we have positive evidence; that they depend on an extra-organic agent, or on a "force" which has not matter for its mass, there is absolutely no evidence.

Evidence? For the most part spiritualists reject what we should call evidence, and rely on "intuitions" as of far deeper validity. This remark does not apply to Dr. Beale, who, although rejecting the doctrine of a Vital Principle, in its earlier forms, insists on a "vital force" as the necessary conclusion to which his microscopical researches lead. It is assuredly from no levity, from no ignorance of what physiologists have done, from no want of patient investigation on his own part, that Dr. Beale adopts the *metaphysiological* view. It is the mirage of "germinal matter" which sustains his conviction of the Power or Force wherewith he replaces the traditional Spirit, Archæus, Nisus Formativus, or Plan. This mysterious and undefined Force is said to "influence the particles of Matter, though it bears neither a qualitative, nor, as far as can be at present proved, a quantitative relation to the matter." Such a conception of a "power transmitted to new particles without loss or diminution in

intensity, and sometimes with actual increase," is so conspicuously not a conception which falls in with what in all other sciences is meant by force, that he may well insist on it as *sui generis*. We must relinquish all that we have learned in Physics and Chemistry, and throw overboard all dynamical principles, before we can accept this force. But if Dr. Beale has any evidence which can prove the existence of such a force, we shall admit that it is not only different from ordinary force, but "capable of directing matter and force,"¹ paradoxical as such statements sound. Meanwhile, in the absence of the needed evidence, all we can say is that, while departing from the scientific conception of Force, he has not given such precision to his own as enables us to understand what it precisely symbolizes for him. He leaves it in a metaphysical mist, to be seen according to the disposition of the seer.

Many readers, who will be quite ready to give up the metaphysiological view of Life, will be quite unprepared to give up the Psychological Principle as the source and substance of all mental phenomena. They may accept Cuvier's explanation that Life is simply the term which expresses a group of phenomena,² but they will not acknowledge that Mind is equally a symbol, the objective concretes of which are to be sought in organic processes. This arises from the dissociation of Life and Mind, which has enabled the psychologist to feel at ease in studying mental phenomena solely on the Introspective Method. Physiology might, it was held, be useful in elucidating Sensation, but could throw no light on Thought. And even Flourens fancied that he had proved experimentally the distinction between Life and Mind, when he proved that the removal of the brain abolished the manifestations of Intelligence without abolishing those of Life. But this was a fallacy. No experiment was needed to prove what stares every one in the face, namely, that the manifestations grouped as Intelligence are specifically different from those grouped as Nutrition, Secretion, &c.; consequently that there must be corresponding difference in their conditions. But to argue from this that there is in Intelligence a distinct Principle which is not the resultant of organic processes, would only have been acceptable had there been evidence of Intelligence away from all organisms.

The spiritualistic hypothesis assumes so many forms, from the crude form of a Spirit inhabiting the body, to the subtle form of

(1) Introduction to Todd and Bowman's Physiology, pp. 35, 92.

(2) "L'idée de la vie est une de ces idées générales et obscures produites en nous par certaines suites de phénomènes que nous voyons se succéder dans un ordre constant, et se tenir par des rapports mutuels. Quoique nous ignorions la nature du lien qui les unit, nous sentons que ce lien doit exister, et cela nous suffit pour nous les faire désigner par un nom que bientôt le vulgaire regarde comme le signe d'un principe particulier, quoiqu'en effet ce nom ne puisse jamais indiquer que l'ensemble des phénomènes qui ont donné lieu à sa formation."—Cuvier, *Anatomie Comparée*.

a substantialised abstraction, that it is difficult to deal with it in a single chapter ; the arguments which refute one writer are powerless against another. At present the hypothesis of a spirit, or special "soul substance," gains little credit. It is generally replaced by a metaphysical abstraction. Thus, Lotze, who has victoriously refuted the idea of a Vital Principle, reproduces the Leibnitzian idea of a parallelism between mental and physical processes, as two series essentially distinct though simultaneous, and mutually conditioned. The elder Fichte declares the soul to be a Process not a Fact (*eine Thathandlung nicht eine Thatſache*) ; and the younger Fichte reproduces this, when declaring the soul to have only a dynamical not a physical existence. From this it is but a step to the organicist hypothesis, which regards the Soul not as a substance, but as a logical subject. The subject is determined by its predicates—is, indeed, nothing but their synthesis. Hence the nature of the Soul is to be sought in the concrete facts of Consciousness ; and since these facts are only known in dependence on organic conditions, it is irrational to seek beyond the organism, and its relations to the medium, for the causes of these concrete facts.

The central position of Spiritualism when, ceasing to urge its negative arguments, it advances positive arguments, is that Consciousness emphatically declares Mind to be something essentially distinct from Matter, and declares it to be simple not composite.

There is a sense in which both these statements are indisputable. Mind and Matter are two abstract symbols, expressive of contrasted aspects ; the one symbolizes all the facts of Feeling, the other all the facts of the Felt. They are as mutually exclusive as Pleasure and Pain. The materialist accepts these distinctions without hesitation. They do not affect his hypothesis that mental phenomena are organic phenomena, and that organic phenomena when objectively considered belong to the objective class named Matter ; consequently that all the canons of research which apply to the class of objective facts apply to the facts of Life and Mind, whatever special character the facts may present.

It is a mistake to suppose that Consciousness directly tells us that Mind is not a group of organic phenomena. Consciousness tells us directly of nothing but itself ; says nothing of how it came to be, of what conditions it is the result. Only reflective analysis can help us here ; and that shows an inseparable twofold aspect, objective and subjective, in every feeling. It shows that here as elsewhere the concrete facts are symbolized in a general term, which by a natural illusion is transformed into an independent existence ; and although we no longer believe in abstract Virtue, or in a Nation which is not the aggregate of its members, we have difficulty in recognising the Mind as an abstraction.

And there is a good reason for this. There is no national consciousness equivalent to the individual consciousness, because there is no national unity equivalent to the individual unity. Each man may feel himself a part of the Nation, and recognise that his acts belong to the national action; but there is no national consciousness reflected in and guiding his acts; whereas the human consciousness is reflected in and guides every individual's acts. In other words, the Nation has no consciousness of Self. It is on this "sense of personality" that Spiritualism relies. Nor am I disposed to under-rate its value, since it was this which nearly converted me. But without pausing here to trace the genesis of this Self-consciousness, it is enough to point out that so far from being an initial principle, it is a very late product of evolution. It arises through the slowly-evolved consensus of the organism, and the syntheses of experience. This is shown in those abnormal cases familiar to students of mental pathology, in which the disturbance of the organic connexus leads to a "double consciousness," or to a "changed personality." The patient refuses to recognise his own voice and his own person as belonging to himself. "Une idée des plus étranges," said one of M. Krishaber's patients, "mais qui m'obsède et s'impose à mon esprit malgré moi, c'est de me croire double. Je sens un moi qui pense et un moi qui exécute; je perds alors le sentiment de la réalité du monde et je ne sais pas si je suis le moi qui pense ou le moi qui exécute."¹

Without wishing to ignore the strength of the argument which Spiritualism derives from the invocation of Consciousness, I will here merely add that all the facts admit of a better interpretation on the organicist hypothesis; but this cannot be shown until we have endeavoured by analysis to trace the evolution of the idea of Self.

Before passing to the consideration of Materialism it may be well to glance at the position taken up by the Agnostics, who evade all the difficulties of the question by a declaration of its lying beyond science. These thinkers, starting from the supposed axiom that causes are unknowable, only effects being knowable, urge that whatever may be the nature of the Vital Force, or the Psychical Principle, there is no occasion for science to moot the question. The phenomena are alone cognisable; it is with them alone that Science concerns itself, leaving to Ontology the phantom-search after causes. Our search should be not for the unknown x , but its known functions.²

The reader of "Problems of Life and Mind" will understand in

(1) Krishaber, *De la Névropathie Cérébrocardiaque*, 1873, p. 46. There are many other examples in this work, and indeed in most general works on Insanity.

(2) Compare Barthez, *Nouvelle Science de l'Homme*, 1806.

how far I agree with and in how far I should restrict this statement. I have argued for the necessity of science limiting its research to known functions, refusing to admit into its equations any unknown quantities, even when these are postulated ; but I have also endeavoured to show that the supposed axiom of causes not being knowable, when their effects are known, is a fallacy, and a misapprehension of the nature of causation ; it is plausible only through the metaphysical postulate that the cause is something different from its effects—something which is itself the unknown quantity ; and then, indeed, the assertion that one cannot know the cause is a truism. I admit that the special conditions which constitute the state of organization are at present very imperfectly known, and may therefore be expressed by the symbol x , or by the familiar symbols Vital Force, Vitality, &c. But to the same extent we are ignorant of the special effects. Our knowledge of the functions is very imperfect and vague ; it is daily becoming more precise, and with each precision there emerges a greater clearness as to the conditions or causes. Nor will there be any clearer insight gained into these by postulating an unknown x as their agent. The agnostic is no better off than the spiritualist, except that he only pretends to explain the facts observed by means of sensible experiences, and does not suffer his inclinations to dictate his conclusions.

GEORGE HENRY LEWES.

(To be concluded in the next Number.)

MACAULAY.

It is told of Strafford that before reading any book for the first time, he would call for a sheet of paper, and then proceed to write down upon it some sketch of the ideas that he already had upon the subject of the book, and of the questions that he expected to find answered. No one who has been at the pains to try the experiment, will doubt the usefulness of Strafford's practice: it gives to our acquisitions from books clearness and reality, a right place and an independent shape. At this moment we are all looking for the biography of an illustrious man of letters, written by a near kinsman, who is himself naturally endowed with keen literary interests, and who has invigorated his academic cultivation by practical engagement in considerable affairs of public business. Before taking up Mr. Trevelyan's two volumes, it is perhaps worth while, on Strafford's plan, to ask ourselves shortly what kind of significance or value belongs to Lord Macaulay's achievements, and to what place he has a claim among the forces of English literature. It is seventeen years since he died, and those of us who never knew him nor ever saw him may now think about his work with that perfect detachment which is impossible in the case of actual contemporaries.

That Macaulay comes in the very front rank in the mind of the ordinary bookbuyer of our day is quite certain. It is an amusement with some people to put an imaginary case of banishment to a desert island, with the privilege of choosing the works of one author, and no more, to furnish literary companionship and refreshment for the rest of a lifetime. Whom would one select for this momentous post? Clearly the author must be voluminous, for days on desert islands are many and long; he must be varied in his moods, his topics, and his interests; he must have a great deal to say, and must have a power of saying it that shall arrest a depressed and dolorous spirit. Englishmen, of course, would with mechanical unanimity call for Shakespeare; Germans could hardly hesitate about Goethe; and a sensible Frenchman would pack up the ninety volumes of Voltaire. It would be at least as interesting to know the object of a second choice, supposing the tyrant were in his clemency to give us two authors. In the case of Englishmen there is some evidence as to a popular preference. A recent traveller in Australia informs us that the three books which he found on every squatter's shelf, and which at last he knew before he crossed the threshold that he should be sure to find, were Shakespeare, the

Bible, and Macaulay's Essays. This is only an illustration of a feeling about Macaulay that has been almost universal among the English-speaking peoples.

We may safely say that no man obtains and keeps for a great many years such a position as this, unless he is possessed of some very extraordinary qualities, or else of common qualities in a very uncommon and extraordinary degree. The world, says Goethe, is more willing to endure the Incongruous than to be patient under the Insignificant. Even those who set least value on what Macaulay does for his readers, may still feel bound to distinguish the elements that have given him his vast popularity. The inquiry is not a piece of merely literary criticism, for it is impossible that the work of so imposing a writer should have passed through the hands of every man and woman of his time who has even the humblest pretensions to cultivation, without leaving a very decided mark on their habits both of thought and expression. As a plain matter of observation, it is impossible to take up a newspaper or a review, for instance, without perceiving Macaulay's influence both in the style and the temper of modern journalism, and journalism in its turn acts upon the style and temper of its enormous uncouth public. The man who now succeeds in catching the ear of the writers of leading articles, is in the position that used to be held by the head of some great theological school, whence disciples swarmed forth to reproduce in ten thousand pulpits the arguments, the opinions, the images, the tricks, the gestures, and the mannerisms of a single master.

Two men of very different kinds have thoroughly impressed the journalists of our time, Macaulay and Mr. Mill. Mr. Carlyle we do not add to them; he is, as the Germans call Jean Paul, *der Einzige*. And he is a poet, while the other two are in their degrees serious and argumentative writers, dealing in different ways with the great topics that constitute the matter and business of daily discussion. They are both of them practical enough to interest men handling real affairs, and yet they are general or theoretical enough to supply such men with the large and ready commonplaces which are so useful to a profession that has to produce literary graces and philosophical decorations at an hour's notice. It might perhaps be said of these two distinguished men that our public writers owe most of their virtues to the one, and most of their vices to the other. If Mill taught some of them to reason, Macaulay tempted more of them to declaim: if Mill set an example of patience, tolerance, and fair examination of hostile opinions, Macaulay did much to encourage oracular arrogance, and a rather too thrasonical complacency; if Mill sowed ideas of the great economic, political, and moral bearings of the forces of society, Macaulay trained a taste for super-

ficial particularities, trivial circumstantialities of local colour, and all the paraphernalia of the pseudo-picturesque.

Of course nothing so obviously untrue is meant as that this is an account of Macaulay's own quality. What is empty pretension in the leading article was often a warranted self-assertion in Macaulay; what is little more than testiness in it, is in him often a generous indignation. What became and still remain in those who have made him their model, substantive and organic vices, the foundation of literary character and intellectual temper, were in him the incidental defects of a vigorous genius. And we have to take a man of his power and vigour with all his drawbacks, for the one are wrapped up in the other. Charles Fox used to apply to Burke a passage that Quintilian wrote about Ovid. "*Si animi sui affectibus temperare quam indulgere maluisset,*" quoted Fox, "*quid vir iste præstare non potuerit!*" But this is really not at all certain either of Ovid, or Burke, or anyone else. It suits moralists to tell us that excellence lies in the happy mean and nice balance of our faculties and impulses, and perhaps in so far as our own contentment and an easy passage through life are involved, what they tell us is true. But for making a mark in the world, for rising to supremacy in art or thought or affairs—whatever those aims may be worth—a man possibly does better to indulge rather than to chide or grudge his genius, and to pay the penalties for his weaknesses rather than run any risk of mutilating those strong faculties of which they happen to be an inseparable accident. Versatility is not a universal gift among the able men of the world; not many of them have so many gifts of the spirit as to be free to choose by what pass they will climb 'the steep where Fame's proud temple shines afar.' If Macaulay had applied himself to the cultivation of a balanced judgment, of tempered phrases, and of relative propositions, he would probably have sunk into an impotent tameness. A great pugilist has sometimes been converted from the error of his ways, and been led zealously to cherish gospel graces, but the hero's discourses have seldom been edifying. Macaulay, divested of all the exorbitancies of his spirit and his style, would have been a Samson shorn of the locks of his strength.

Although, however, a writer of marked quality may do well to let his genius develope its spontaneous forces without too assiduous or vigilant repression, trusting to other writers of equal strength in other directions, and to the general fitness of things and operation of time, to redress the balance, still it is the task of criticism in counting up the contributions of one of these strong men to examine the mischiefs no less than the benefits incident to their work. There is no puny carping nor cavilling in the process. It is because such men are strong that they are able to do harm, and they may injure the taste and judgment of a whole generation, just because they are never mediocre. That is implied in

strength. Macaulay is not to be measured now merely as if he were the author of a new book. His influence has been a distinct literary force, and in an age of reading, this is to be a distinct force in deciding the temper, the process, the breadth, of men's opinions, no less than the manner of expressing them. It is no new observation that the influence of an author becomes in time something apart from his books, and that a certain generalised or abstract personality impresses itself on our minds, long after we have forgotten the details of his opinions, the arguments by which he enforced them, and even, what are usually the last to escape us, the images by which he illustrated them. Phrases and sentences are a mask: but we detect the features of the man behind the mask. This personality of a favourite author is a real and powerful agency. Unconsciously we are infected with his humours; we apply his methods; we find ourselves copying the rhythm and measure of his periods; we wonder how he would have acted, or thought, or spoken in our circumstances. Usually a strong writer leaves a special mark in some particular region of mental activity: the final product of him is to fix some persistent religious mood, or some decisive intellectual bias, or else some trick of the tongue. Now Macaulay has contributed no philosophic ideas to the speculative stock, nor has he developed any one great historic or social truth. His work is always full of a high spirit of manliness, probity, and honour; but he is not of that small band to whom we may apply Mackintosh's thrice and four times enviable panegyric on the eloquence of Dugald Stewart, that its peculiar glory consisted in having 'breathed the love of virtue into whole generations of pupils.' He has painted many striking pictures, and imparted a certain reality to our conception of many great scenes of the past. He did good service in banishing once for all those sentimental Jacobite leanings and prejudices which had been kept alive by the sophistry of the most popular of historians, and the imagination of the most popular of romance-writers. But where he set his stamp has been upon style; style in its widest sense, not merely on the grammar and mechanism of writing, but on what De Quincey described as its *organology*; style, that is to say, in its relation to ideas and feelings, its commerce with thought, and its reaction on what one may call the temper or conscience of the intellect.

Let no man suppose that it matters little whether the most universally popular of the serious authors of a generation—and Macaulay was nothing less than this—affects *style coupé* or *style soutenu*. The critic of style is not the dancing-master, declaiming on the deep ineffable things that lie in a minuet. He is not the virtuoso of supines and gerundives. The morality of style goes deeper 'than dull fools suppose.' When Comte took pains to prevent any sentence exceeding two lines of his manuscript or five

of print; to restrict every paragraph to seven sentences; to exclude every hiatus between two sentences or even between two paragraphs; and never to reproduce any word, except the auxiliary monosyllables, in two consecutive sentences; he justified his literary solicitude by insisting on the wholesomeness alike to heart and intelligence of submission to artificial institutions. He felt, after he had once mastered the habit of the new yoke, that it became the source of continual and unforeseeable improvements even in thought, and he perceived that the reason why verse is a higher kind of literary perfection than prose, is that verse imposes a greater number of rigorous forms. We may add that verse itself is perfected, in the hands of men of poetic genius, in proportion to the severity of this mechanical regulation. Where Pope or Racine had one rule of metre, Victor Hugo has twenty, and he observes them as rigorously as an algebraist or an astronomer observes the rules of calculation or demonstration. One, then, who touches the style of a generation acquires no trifling authority over its thought and temper, as well as over the length of its sentences.

The first and most obvious secret of Macaulay's place on popular bookshelves is that he has a true genius for narration, and narration will always in the eyes not only of our squatters in the Australian bush, but of the many all over the world, stand first among literary gifts. The common run of plain men, as has been noticed since the beginning of the world, are as eager as children for a story, and like children they will embrace the man who will tell them a story, with abundance of details and plenty of colour, and a realistic assurance that it is no mere make-believe. Macaulay never stops to brood over an incident or a character, with an inner eye intent on penetrating to the lowest depth of motive and cause, to the furthest complexity of impulse, calculation, and subtle incentive. The spirit of analysis is not in him, and the divine spirit of meditation is not in him. His whole mind runs in action and movement; it busies itself with eager interest in all objective particulars. He is seized by the external and the superficial, and revels in every detail that appeals to the five senses. "The brilliant Macaulay," said Emerson, with slight exaggeration, "who expresses the tone of the English governing classes of the day, explicitly teaches that *good* means good to eat, good to wear, material commodity." So ready a faculty of exultation in the exceeding great glories of taste and touch, of loud sound and glittering spectacle, is a gift of the utmost service to the narrator who craves immense audiences. Let it be said that if Macaulay exults in the details that go to our five senses, his sensuousness is always clean, manly, and fit for honest daylight and the summer sun. There is none of that curious odour of autumnal

decay that clings to the passion of a more modern school for colour and flavour and the enumerated treasures of subtle indulgence.

Mere picturesqueness, however, is a minor qualification compared with another quality which everybody assumes himself to have, but which is in reality extremely uncommon; the quality, I mean, of telling a tale directly and in straightforward order. In speaking of Hallam, Macaulay complained that Gibbon had brought into fashion an unpleasant trick of telling a story by implication and allusion. This provoking obliquity has certainly increased rather than declined since Hallam's day, and it has reached its height and climax in the latest addition of all to our works of popular history, Mr. Green's clever book upon the English People. Mr. Froude, it is true, whatever may be his shortcomings on the side of sound moral and political judgment, has admirable gifts in the way of straightforward narration, and Mr. Freeman, when he does not press too hotly after emphasis and abstains from overloading his account with superabundance of detail, is usually excellent in the way of direct description. Still, it is not merely because these two writers are alive and Macaulay is not, that most people would say of him that he is unequalled in our time in his mastery of the art of letting us know in an express and unmistakable way exactly what it was that happened, though it is quite true that in many portions of his too elaborated History of William the Third he describes a large number of events about which, I think, no sensible man can in the least care either how they happened, or whether indeed they happened at all or not.

Another reason why people have sought Macaulay is that he has in one way or another something to tell them about many of the most striking personages and interesting events in the history of mankind. And he does really tell them something. If any one will be at the trouble to count up the number of those names that belong to the world and time, about which Macaulay has found not merely something, but something definite and pointed to say, he will be astonished to see how large a portion of the wide historic realm is traversed in that ample flight of reference, allusion, and illustration, and what unsparing copiousness of knowledge gives substance, meaning, and attraction to that blaze and glare of rhetoric.

Macaulay came upon the world of letters, just as the middle classes were expanding into enormous prosperity, were vastly increasing in numbers, and were becoming more alive than they had ever been before to literary interests. His Essays are as good as a library; they make an incomparable manual and vade-mecum for a busy uneducated man who has curiosity and enlightenment enough to wish to know a little about the great lives and great thoughts, the shining words and many-coloured complexities of action, that have marked the journey of man through the ages. Macaulay had an

intimate acquaintance both with the imaginative literature and the history of Greece and Rome, with the literature and the history of modern Italy, of France, and of England. Whatever his special subject, he contrives to pour into it with singular dexterity a stream of rich, graphic, and telling illustrations from all these widely diversified sources. Figures from history, ancient and modern, sacred and secular; characters from plays and novels from Plautus down to Walter Scott and Jane Austen; images and similes from poets of every age and every nation, 'pastoral, pastoral-comical, historical-pastoral, tragical-historical;' shrewd thrusts from satirists, wise saws from sages, pleasantries caustic or pathetic from humorists; all throng Macaulay's pages with the bustle and variety and animation of some glittering masque and cosmoramic revel of great books and heroic men. Hence, though Macaulay was in mental constitution one of the very least Shakespearian writers that ever lived, yet he has the Shakespearian quality of taking his reader through an immense gallery of interesting characters and striking situations. No writer can now expect to attain the widest popularity as a man of letters unless he gives to the world *multa* as well as *multum*. Sainte-Beuve, the most eminent man of letters in France in our generation, wrote no less than twenty-seven volumes of his incomparable *Causeries*. Mr. Carlyle, the most eminent man of letters in England in our generation, has taught us that silence is golden in thirty volumes. Macaulay was not so exuberantly copious as these two illustrious writers, but he had the art of being as various without being so voluminous.

There has been a great deal of deliberate and systematic imitation of Macaulay's style, often by clever men who might well have trusted to their own resources. Its most conspicuous vices are very easy to imitate, but it is impossible for any one who is less familiar with literature than Macaulay was, to reproduce his style effectively, for the reason that it is before all else the style of great literary knowledge. Nor is that all. Macaulay's knowledge was not only very wide; it was both thoroughly accurate and instantly ready. For this stream of apt illustrations he was indebted to his extraordinary memory, and his rapid eye for contrasts and analogies. They come to the end of his pen as he writes; they are not laboriously hunted out in indexes, and then added by way of afterthought and extraneous interpolation. Hence quotations and references that in a writer even of equal knowledge, but with his wits less promptly about him, would seem mechanical and awkward, find their place in a page of Macaulay as if by a delightful process of complete assimilation and spontaneous fusion.

We may be sure that no author could have achieved Macaulay's boundless popularity among his contemporaries, unless his work had

abounded in what is substantially *Commonplace*. Addison puts fine writing in sentiments that are natural without being obvious, and this is a true account of the 'law' of the exquisite literature of the Queen Anne men. We may perhaps add to Addison's definition, that the great secret of the best kind of popularity is always the noble or imaginative handling of *Commonplace*. Shakespeare may at first seem an example to the contrary; and indeed is it not a standing marvel that the greatest writer of a nation that is distinguished among all nations for the pharisaism, puritanism, and unimaginative narrowness of its judgments on conduct and type of character, should be paramount over all writers for the breadth, maturity, fulness, subtlety, and infinite variousness of his conception of human life and nature? One possible answer to the perplexity is that the puritanism does not go below the surface in us, and that Englishmen are not really limited in their view by the too strait formulas that are supposed to contain their explanations of the moral universe. On this theory the popular appreciation of Shakespeare is the irrepressible response of the hearty inner man to a voice in which he recognises the full note of human nature, and those wonders of the world which are not dreamt of in his professed philosophy. A more obvious answer than this is that Shakespeare's popularity with the many is not due to those finer glimpses that are the very essence of all poetic delight to the few, but to his thousand other magnificent attractions, and above all, after his skill as a pure dramatist and master of scenic interest and situation, to the lofty or pathetic setting with which he vivifies, not the subtleties or refinements, but the commonest and most elementary traits of the commonest and most elementary human moods. The few with minds touched by nature or right cultivation to the finer issues, admire the supreme genius which takes some poor Italian tale, with its coarse plot and gross personages, and shooting it through with threads of variegated meditation, produces a masterpiece of penetrative reflection and high pensive suggestion as to the deepest things and most secret parts of the life of men. But to the general these finer threads are undiscernible. What touches them, and most rightly touches them and us all, in the Shakespearian poetry, are topics eternally old, yet of eternal freshness, the perennial truisms of the grave and the bride-chamber, of shifting fortune, the surprises of destiny, the emptiness of the answered vow. This is the region in which the poet wins his widest if not his hardest triumphs, the region of the noble *Commonplace*.

A writer dealing with such matters as principally occupied Macaulay has not the privilege of resort to these great poetic inspirations. Yet history, too, has its generous commonplaces, its plausibilities of emotion, and no one has ever delighted more than Macaulay did to appeal to the fine truisms that cluster round love of freedom and love of native land. The high rhetorical topics of liberty and patriotism are his

readiest instruments for kindling a glowing reflection of these magnanimous passions in the breasts of his readers. That Englishman is hardly to be envied who can read without a glow such passages as that in the History about Turenne being startled by the shout of stern exultation with which his English allies advanced to the combat, and expressing the delight of a true soldier when he learned that it was ever the fashion of Cromwell's pikemen to rejoice greatly when they beheld the enemy; while even the banished cavaliers felt an emotion of national pride when they saw a brigade of their countrymen, outnumbered by foes and abandoned by friends, drive before it in headlong rout the finest infantry of Spain, and force a passage into a counterscarp which had just been pronounced impregnable by the ablest of the marshals of France. Such prose as this is not less thrilling to a man who loves his country, than the spirited verse of the Lays of Ancient Rome. And the commonplaces of patriotism and freedom would never have been so powerful in Macaulay's hands if they had not been inspired by a sincere and hearty faith in them in the soul of the writer. His unanalytical turn of mind kept him free of any temptation to think of love of country as a prejudice, or a passion for freedom as an illusion. The cosmopolitan or international idea which such teachers as Cobden have tried to impress on our stubborn islanders, would have found in Macaulay not lukewarm or sceptical adherence, but pointblank opposition and denial. He believed as stoutly in the supremacy of Great Britain in the history of the good causes of Europe, as M. Thiers believes in the supremacy of France, or Mazzini believed in that of Italy. The thought of the prodigious industry, the inventiveness, the stout enterprise, the free government, the wise and equal laws, the noble literature, of this fortunate island and its majestic empire beyond the seas, and the discretion, valour, and tenacity by which all these great material and still greater intangible possessions had been first won and then kept against every hostile comer whether domestic or foreign, sent through Macaulay a thrill, like that which the thought of Paris and its heroisms moves in the great poet of France, or sight of the dear city of the Violet Crown moved in an Athenian of old. Thus habitually, with all sincerity of heart, to offer to one of the greater popular prepossessions the incense due to any other idol of superstition, sacred and of indisputable authority, and to let this adoration be seen shining in every page, is one of the keys that every man must find who would make a quick and sure way into the temple of contemporary fame.

It is one of the first things to be said about Macaulay, that he was in exact accord with the common average sentiment of his day on every subject on which he spoke. His superiority was not of that highest kind which leads a man to march in thought on the outside margin of

the crowd, watching them, sympathising with them, hoping for them, but apart. Macaulay was one of the middle-class crowd in his heart, and only rose above it by extraordinary gifts of expression. He had none of that ambition which inflames some hardy men, to make new beliefs and new passions enter the minds of their neighbours; his ascendancy is due to literary pomp, not to fecundity of spirit. No one has ever surpassed him in the art of combining resolute and ostentatious common sense of a slightly coarse sort in choosing his point of view, with so considerable an appearance of dignity and elevation in setting it forth and impressing it upon others. The elaborateness of his style is very likely to mislead people into imagining for him a corresponding elaborateness of thought and sentiment. On the contrary, Macaulay's mind was really very simple, strait, and with as few notes in its register, to borrow a phrase from the language of vocal compass, as there are few notes, though they are very loud, in the register of his written prose. When we look more closely into it, what at first wore the air of dignity and elevation, in truth rather disagreeably resembles the narrow assurance of a man who knows that he has with him the great battalions of public opinion. We are always quite sure that if Macaulay had been an Athenian citizen towards the ninety-fifth Olympiad, he would have taken sides with Anytus and Meletus in the impeachment of Socrates. A popular author must take the accepted maxims for granted in a thoroughgoing way. He must suppress any whimsical fancy for applying the Socratic elenchus, or any other engine of criticism, scepticism, or verification, to those sentiments or current precepts of morals, which may in fact be very two-sided and may be much neglected in practice, but which the public opinion of his time requires to be treated in theory and in literature as if they had been cherished and held sacred *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*.

This is just what Macaulay does, and it is commonly supposed to be no heavy fault in him or any other writer for the common public. Man cannot live by analysis alone, nor nourish himself on the secret delights of irony. And if Macaulay had only reflected the more generous of the prejudices of mankind, it would have been well enough. Burke, for instance, was a writer who revered the prejudices of a modern society as deeply as Macaulay did; he believed society to be founded on prejudices and held compact by them. Yet what size there is in Burke, what fine perspective, what momentum, what edification! It may be pleaded that there is the literature of edification, and there is the literature of knowledge, and that the qualities proper to the one cannot lawfully be expected from the other, and would only be very much out of place if they should happen to be found there. But there are two answers to this. First, Macaulay in the course of his varied writings discusses all

sorts of ethical and other matters, and is not simply a chronicler of party and intrigue, of dynasties and campaigns. Second, and more than this, even if he had never travelled beyond the composition of historical record, he could still have sown his pages, as does every truly great writer, no matter what his subject may be, with those significant images or far-reaching suggestions, which suddenly light up a whole range of distant thoughts and sympathies within us; which in an instant affect the sensibilities of men with a something new and unforeseen; and which awaken, if only for a passing moment, the faculty and response of the diviner mind. Tacitus does all this, and Burke does it; and that is why men who care nothing for Roman despots or for Jacobin despots, will still perpetually turn to those writers almost as if they were on the level of great poets or very excellent spiritual teachers.

One secret is that they, and all such men as they were, had that of which Macaulay can hardly have had the rudimentary germ, the faculty of deep abstract meditation and surrender to the fruitful 'leisures of the spirit.' We can picture Macaulay talking, or making a speech in the House of Commons, or buried in a book, or scouring his library for references, or covering his blue foolscap with dashing periods, or accentuating his sentences and barbing his phrases; but can anybody think of him as meditating, as modestly pondering and wondering, as possessed for so much as ten minutes by that spirit of inwardness which has never been wholly wanting in any of those kings and princes of literature, with whom it is good for men to sit in counsel? He seeks Truth, not as she should be sought, devoutly, tentatively, and with the air of one touching the hem of a sacred garment, but clutching her by the hair of the head and dragging her after him in a kind of boisterous triumph, a prisoner of war and not a goddess.

All this finds itself reflected, as the inner temper of a man always is reflected, in his style of written prose. The merits of his prose are obvious enough. It naturally reproduces the good qualities of his understanding, its strength, manliness, and directness. That exultation in material goods and glories of which we have already spoken makes his pages rich in colour, and gives them the effect of a sumptuous gala-suit. Certainly the brocade is too brand-new, and has none of the delicate charm that comes to such finery when it is a little faded. Again, nobody can have any excuse for not knowing exactly what it is that Macaulay means. We may assuredly say of his prose what Boileau says of his own poetry—'*Et mon vers, bien ou mal, dit toujours quelque chose.*' This is a prodigious merit, when we reflect with what fatal alacrity human language lends itself in the hands of so many performers upon the pliant instrument, to all sorts of obscurity, ambiguity, disguise and pretentious mystifi-

cation. Scaliger is supposed to have remarked of the Basques and their desperate tongue: 'Tis said the Basques understand one another; for my part, I will never believe it.' The same pungent doubt might apply to loftier members of the hierarchy of speech than that forlorn dialect, but never to English as handled by Macaulay. He never wrote an obscure sentence in his life, and this may seem a small merit, until we remember of how few writers we could say the same.

Macaulay is of those who think prose as susceptible of polished and definite form as verse, and he was, we should suppose, of those also who hold the type and mould of all written language to be spoken language. There are more reasons for demurring to the soundness of the latter doctrine than can conveniently be made to fill a digression here. For one thing, spoken language necessarily implies one or more listeners, whereas written language may often have to express meditative moods and trains of inward reflection that move through the mind without trace of external reference, and that would lose their special traits by the introduction of any suspicion that they were to be overheard. Again, even granting that all composition must be supposed to be meant by the fact of its existence to be addressed to a body of readers, it still remains to be shown that indirect address to the inner ear should follow the same method and rhythm as address directly through impressions on the outer organ. The attitude of the recipient mind is different, and there is the symbolism of a new medium between it and the speaker. The writer, being cut off from all those effects which are producible by the physical intonations of the voice, has to find substitutes for them by other means, by subtler cadences, by a more varied modulation, by firmer notes, by more complex circuits, than suffice for the utmost perfection of spoken language, which has all the potent and manifold aids of personality. In writing, whether it be prose or verse, you are free to produce effects whose peculiarity one can only define vaguely by saying that the senses have one part less in them than in any other of the forms and effects of art, and the imaginary voice one part more. But the question need not be laboured here, because there can be no dispute as to the quality of Macaulay's prose. Its measures are emphatically the measures of spoken deliverance. Those who have made the experiment, pronounce him to be one of the authors whose works are most admirably fitted for reading aloud. His firmness and directness of statement, his spiritedness, his art of selecting salient and highly coloured detail, and all his other merits as a narrator keep the listener's attention, and make him the easiest of writers to follow.

Although, however, clearness, directness, and positiveness are master qualities and the indispensable foundations of all good style,

yet does the matter plainly by no means end with them. And it is even possible to have these virtues so unhappily proportioned and inauspiciously mixed with other turns and casts of mind, as to end in work with little grace or harmony or fine tracery about it, but only overweening purpose and vehement will. And it is overweeningness and self-confident will that are the chief notes of Macaulay's style. It has no benignity. Energy is doubtless a delightful quality, but then Macaulay's energy is energy without momentum, and he impresses us more by a strong volubility than by volume. It is the energy of intellects and intuitions, which though they are profoundly sincere if ever they were sincere in any man, are yet in the relations which they comprehend, essentially superficial.

Still, trenchancy whether in speaker or writer is a most effective tone for a large public. It gives them confidence in their man, and prevents tediousness,—except to those who reflect how delicate is the poise of truth, what steep and pits encompass the dealer in unqualified propositions. To such persons, a writer who is trenchant in every sentence of every page, who never lapses for a line into the contingent, who marches through the intricacies of things in a blaze of certainty, is not only a writer to be distrusted, but the owner of a doubtful and displeasing style. It is a great test of style to watch how an author disposes of the qualifications, limitations, and exceptions that clog the wings of his main proposition. The grave and conscientious men of the seventeenth century insisted on packing them all honestly along with the main proposition itself within the bounds of a single period. Burke arranges them in tolerably close order in the paragraph. Dr. Newman, that winning writer, disperses them lightly over his page. Of Macaulay it is hardly unfair to say that he dispatches all qualifications into outer space before he begins to write, or if he magnanimously admits one or two here and there, it is only to bring them the more imposingly to the same murderous end.

We have spoken of Macaulay's interests and intuitions wearing a certain air of superficiality; there is a feeling of the same kind about his attempts to be genial. It is not truly festive. There is no abandonment in it. It has no deep root in moral humour, and is merely a literary form, resembling nothing so much as the hard geniality of some clever college tutor of stiff manners entertaining undergraduates at an official breakfast-party. This is not because his tone is bookish; on the contrary, his tone and level are distinctly those of the man of the world. But one always seems to find that neither a wide range of cultivation nor familiar access to the best Whig circles had quite removed the stiffness and self-conscious precision of the Clapham Sect. We would give much for a little more flexibility, and would welcome even a slight consciousness of infirmity. As has been said, the only people whom men

cannot pardon are the perfect. Macaulay is like the military king who never suffered himself to be seen, even by the attendants in his bedchamber, until he had had time to put on his uniform and jack-boots. His severity of eye is very wholesome; it makes his writing firm, and firmness is certainly one of the first qualities that good writing must have. But there is such a thing as soft and considerate precision, as well as hard and scolding precision. Those most interesting English critics of the generation slightly anterior to Macaulay,—Hazlitt, Lamb, De Quincey, Leigh Hunt,—were fully his equals in precision, and yet they knew how to be clear, acute, and definite, without that edginess and inelasticity which is so conspicuous in Macaulay's criticisms, alike in their matter and their form.

To borrow the figure of an old writer, Macaulay's prose is not like a flowing vestment to his thought, but like a suit of armour. It is often splendid and glittering, and the movement of the opening pages of his History is superb in its dignity. But that movement is exceptional. As a rule there is the hardness, if there is also often the sheen, of highly-wrought metal. Or, to change our figure, his pages are composed as a handsome edifice is reared, not as a fine statue or a frieze 'with bossy sculptures graven' grows up in the imaginative mind of the statuary. There is no liquid continuity, such as indicates a writer possessed by his subject and not merely possessing it. The periods are marshalled in due order of procession, bright and high-stepping; they never escape under an impulse of emotion into the full current of a brimming stream. What is curious is that though Macaulay seems ever to be brandishing a two-edged gleaming sword, and though he steep us in an atmosphere of belligerency, yet we are never conscious of inward agitation in him, and perhaps this alone would debar him from a place among the greatest writers. For they, under that reserve, suppression, or management, which is an indispensable condition of the finest rhetorical art, even when aiming at the most passionate effects, still succeed in conveying to their readers a thrilling sense of the strong fires that are glowing underneath. Now when Macaulay advances with his hectoring sentences and his rough pistolling ways, we feel all the time that his pulse is as steady as that of the most practised duellist who ever ate fire. He is too cool to be betrayed into a single phrase of happy improvisation. His pictures glare, but are seldom warm. Those strokes of minute circumstantiality which he loved so dearly, show that even in moments when his imagination might seem to be moving both spontaneously and ardently, it was really only a literary instrument, a fashioning tool and not a melting flame. Let us take a single example. He is describing the trial of Warren Hastings. "Every step in the proceedings," he says,

"carried the mind either backward through many troubled centuries to the days when the foundations of our constitution were laid; or far away over boundless seas and deserts, to dusky nations living under strange stars, worshipping strange gods, and writing strange characters from right to left." The odd triviality of the last detail, its unworthiness of the sentiment of the passage, leaves the reader checked; what sets out as a fine stroke of imagination dwindles down to a sort of literary conceit. And so in other places, even where the writer is most deservedly admired for gorgeous picturesque effect, we feel that it is only the literary picturesque, a kind of infinitely glorified newspaper-reporting. Compare, for instance, the most imaginative piece to be found in any part of Macaulay's writings with that sudden and lovely apostrophe in Carlyle, after describing the bloody horrors that followed the fall of the Bastille in 1789:—"O evening sun of July, how, at this hour, thy beams fall slant on reapers amid peaceful woody fields; on old women spinning in cottages; on ships far out in the silent main; on balls at the Orangerie of Versailles, where high-rouged dames of the Palace are even now dancing with double-jacketed Hussar-officers;—and also on this roaring Hell-porch of a Hôtel de Ville!" Who does not feel in this the breath of poetic inspiration, and how different it is from the mere composite of the rhetorician's imagination, assiduously working to order?

This remark is no disparagement of Macaulay's genius, but a classification of it. We are interrogating our own impressions, and asking ourselves among what kind of writers he ought to be placed. Rhetoric is a good and worthy art, and rhetorical authors are often more useful, more instructive, more really respectable than poetical authors. But it is to be said that Macaulay as a rhetorician will hardly be placed in the first rank by those who have studied both him and the great masters. Once more, no amount of embellishment or emphasis or brilliant figure suffices to produce this intense effect of agitation rigorously restrained; nor can any beauty of decoration be in the least a substitute for that touching and penetrative music which is made in prose by the repressed trouble of grave and high souls. There is a certain music, we do not deny, in Macaulay, but it is the music of a man everlastingly playing for us rapid solos on a silver trumpet, never the swelling diapacons of the organ, and never the deep ecstasies of the four magic strings. That so sensible a man as Macaulay should keep clear of the modern abomination of dithyrambic prose, that rank and sprawling weed of speech, was natural enough; but then the effects which we miss in him, and which, considering how strong the literary faculty in him really was, we are almost astonished to miss, are not produced by dithyramb but by repression. Of course the answer has been

already given ; Macaulay, powerful and vigorous as he was, had no agitation, no wonder, no tumult of spirit, to repress. The world was spread out clear before him ; he read it as plainly and as certainly as he read his books ; life was all an affair of direct categoricals.

This was at least one secret of those hard modulations and shallow cadences. How poor is the rhythm of Macaulay's prose, we only realise by going with his periods fresh in our ear to some true master of harmony. It is not worth while to quote passages from an author who is in everybody's library, and Macaulay is always so much like himself that almost any one page will serve for an illustration exactly as well as any other. Let anyone turn to his character of Somers, for whom he had much admiration, and then turn to Clarendon's character of Falkland ;—"a person of such prodigious parts of learning and knowledge, of that inimitable sweetness and delight in conversation, of so flowing and obliging a humanity and goodness to mankind, and of that primitive simplicity and integrity of life, that if there were no other brand upon this odious and accursed civil war than that single loss, it must be most infamous and execrable to all posterity." Now Clarendon is not a great writer, nor even a good writer, for he is prolix and involved, yet we see that even Clarendon, when he comes to a matter in which his heart is engaged, becomes sweet and harmonious in his rhythm. If we turn to a prose-writer of the very first place, we are instantly conscious of a still greater difference. How flashy and shallow Macaulay's periods seem as we listen to the fine ground-base that rolls in the melody of the following passage of Burke's, and it is taken from one of the least ornate of all his pieces :—

"You will not, we trust, believe, that, born in a civilized country, formed to gentle manners, trained in a merciful religion, and living in enlightened and polished times, where even foreign hostility is softened from its original sternness, we could have thought of letting loose upon you, our late beloved brethren, these fierce tribes of savages and cannibals, in whom the traces of human nature are effaced by ignorance and barbarity. We rather wished to have joined with you in bringing gradually that unhappy part of mankind into civility, order, piety, and virtuous discipline, than to have confirmed their evil habits and increased their natural ferocity by fleshing them in the slaughter of you, whom our wiser and better ancestors had sent into the wilderness with the express view of introducing, along with our holy religion, its humane and charitable manners. We do not hold that all things are lawful in war. We should think every barbarity, in fire, in wasting, in murders, in tortures, and other cruelties, too horrible and too full of turpitude for Christian mouths to utter or ears to hear, if done at our instigation, by those who we know will make war thus if they make it at all, to be, to all intents and purposes, as if done by ourselves. We clear ourselves to you our brethren, to the present age, and to future generations, to our king and our country, and to Europe,

which, as a spectator, beholds this tragic scene, of every part or share in adding this last and worst of evils to the inevitable mischiefs of a civil war.

"We do not call you rebels and traitors. We do not call for the vengeance of the crown against you. We do not know how to qualify millions of our countrymen, contending with one heart for an admission to privileges which we have ever thought our own happiness and honor, by odious and unworthy names. On the contrary, we highly revere the principles on which you act, though we lament some of their effects. Armed as you are, we embrace you, as our friends and as our brethren by the best and dearest ties of relation."

It may be said that there is a patent injustice in comparing the prose of a historian criticising or describing great events at second hand, with the prose of a statesman taking active part in great events, fired by the passion of a present conflict, and stimulated by the vivid interest of undetermined issues. If this be a well grounded plea, and it may be so, then of course it excludes a contrast not only with Burke, but also with Bolingbroke, whose fine manners and polished gaiety give us a keen sense of the grievous garishness of Macaulay. If we may not imitate a comparison between Macaulay and great actors on the stage of affairs, at least there can be no objection to the introduction of Southey as a standard of comparison. Southey was a man of letters pure and simple, and it is worth remarking that Macaulay himself admitted that he found so great a charm in Southey's style, as nearly always to read it with pleasure, even when Southey was talking nonsense. Now, take any page of the *Life of Nelson* or the *Life of Wesley*; consider how easy, smooth, natural, and winning is the diction and the rise and fall of the sentence, and yet how varied the rhythm and how nervous the phrases; and then turn to a page of Macaulay, and wince under its stamping emphasis, its overcoloured tropes, its exaggerated expressions, its unlovely staccato. Southey's history of the Peninsular War is now dead, but if any of my readers has a copy on his highest shelves, I would venture to ask him to take down the third volume, and read the concluding pages, of which Coleridge used to say that they were the finest specimen of historic eulogy he had ever read in English, adding with forgivable hyperbole, that they were more to the Duke's fame and glory than a campaign. "Foresight and enterprise with our commander went hand in hand; he never advanced but so as to be sure of his retreat; and never retreated but in such an attitude as to impose upon a superior enemy," and so on through the sum of Wellington's achievements. "There was something more precious than these, more to be desired than the high and enduring fame which he had secured by his military achievements, the satisfaction of thinking to what end those achievements had been directed; that they were for the deliverance of two most injured and grievously oppressed nations; for the safety, honour, and welfare of

his own country ; and for the general interests of Europe and of the civilized world. His campaigns were sanctified by the cause ; they were sullied by no cruelties, no crimes ; the chariot-wheels of his triumphs have been followed by no curses ; his laurels are entwined with the amaranths of righteousness, and upon his death-bed he might remember his victories among his good works."

With this exquisite modulation still delighting the ear, we open Macaulay's Essays and stumble on such sentences as this : "That Tickell should have been guilty of a villany seems to us highly improbable. That Addison should have been guilty of a villany seems to us highly improbable. But that these two men should have conspired together to commit a villany seems to us improbable in a tenfold degree." *Ὁ μισθὸν, καὶ παμμισθόν, καὶ μισρώτατον !* Surely this is the very burlesque and travesty of a style. Yet it is a characteristic passage. It would be easy to find a thousand examples of the same vicious workmanship, and it would be difficult to find a page in which these cut and disjointed sentences are not the type and mode of the prevailing rhythm.

What is worse than want of depth and fineness of intonation in a period is all gross excess of colour, because excess of colour is connected with graver faults in the region of the intellectual conscience. Macaulay is a constant sinner in this respect. The wine of truth is in his cup a brandied draught, a hundred degrees above proof, and he too often replenishes the lamp of knowledge with naphtha instead of fine oil. It is not that he has a spontaneous passion for exuberant decoration, which he would have shared with more than one of the greatest names in literature. On the contrary, we feel that the exaggerated words and dashing sentences are the fruit of deliberate travail, and the petulance or the irony of his speech is mostly due to a driving predilection for strong effects. His memory, his directness, his aptitude for forcing things into firm outline, and giving them a sharply defined edge,—these and other singular talents of his all lent themselves to this intrepid and indefatigable pursuit of effect. And the most disagreeable feature is that Macaulay was so often content with an effect of an essentially vulgar kind, offensive to taste, discordant to the fastidious ear, and worst of all, at enmity with the whole spirit of truth. By vulgar we certainly do not mean homely, which marks a wholly different quality. No writer can be more homely than Mr. Carlyle, alike in his choice of particulars to dwell upon, and in the terms or images in which he describes or illustrates them, but there is also no writer further removed from vulgarity. Nor do we mean that Macaulay too copiously enriches the tongue with infusion from any Doric dialect. For such raciness he had little taste. What we find in him is that quality which the French call brutal. The description, for instance, in the essay on

Hallam, of the license of the Restoration, seems to us a coarse and vulgar picture, whose painter took the most garish colours he could find on his palette and laid them on in untempered crudity. And who is not sensible of the vulgarity and coarseness of the account of Boswell? "If he had not been a great fool, he would not have been a great writer . . . he was a dunce, a parasite, and a coxcomb," and so forth, in which the shallowness of the analysis of Boswell's character matches the puerile rudeness of the terms. Here, again, is a sentence about Montesquieu. "The English at that time," Macaulay says of the middle of the eighteenth century, "considered a Frenchman who talked about constitutional checks and fundamental laws as a prodigy not less astonishing than the learned pig or musical infant." And he then goes on to describe the author of one of the most important books that ever were written as "specious but shallow, studious of effect, indifferent to truth—the lively President," and so forth, stirring in any reader who happens to know Montesquieu's influence, a singular amazement. We are not concerned with the judgment upon Montesquieu, nor with the truth as to contemporary English opinion about him, but a writer who devises an antithesis to such a man as Montesquieu in learned pigs and musical infants, deliberately condescends not merely to triviality or levity but to flat vulgarity of thought, to something of mean and ignoble association. Though one of the most common, this is not Macaulay's only sin in the same unfortunate direction. He too frequently resorts to vulgar gaudiness. For example, there is in one place a certain description of an alleged practice of Addison's. Swift had said of Esther Johnson that "whether from her easiness in general, or from her indifference to persons, or from her despair of mending them, or from the same practice which she most liked in Mr. Addison, I cannot determine; but when she saw any of the company very warm in a wrong opinion, she was more inclined to confirm them in it than to oppose them. It prevented noise, she said, and saved time."¹ Let us behold what a picture Macaulay draws on the strength of this passage. "If his first attempts to set a presuming dunce right were ill-received," Macaulay says of Addison, "he changed his tone, 'assented with civil leer,' and lured the flattered coxcomb deeper and deeper into absurdity." To compare this transformation of the simplicity of the original into the grotesque heat and overcharged violence of the copy, is to see the homely maiden of a country village transformed into the painted flaunter of the city.

One more instance. We should be sorry to violate any sentiment of τὸ σεμνόν about a man of Macaulay's genius, but what is a decorous term for a description of the doctrine of Lucretius's great

(1) Forster's "Swift," i. 265.

poem, thrown in parenthetically, as the "silliest and meanest system of natural and moral philosophy"? Even disagreeable artifices of composition may be forgiven when they serve to vivify truth, to quicken or to widen the moral judgment, but Macaulay's hardy and habitual recourse to strenuous superlatives is fundamentally unscientific and untrue. There is no more instructive example in our literature than he, of the saying that the adjective is the enemy of the substantive.

In 1837 Jeffrey saw a letter written by Macaulay to a common friend, and stating the reasons for preferring a literary to a political life. Jeffrey thought that his illustrious ally was wrong in the conclusion to which he came. "As to the tranquillity of an author's life," he said, "I have no sort of faith in it. And as to fame, if an author's is now and then more lasting, it is generally longer withheld, and except in a few rare cases it is of a less pervading or elevating description. A great poet or a great *original* writer is above all other glory. But who would give much for such a glory as Gibbon's? Besides, I believe it is in the inward glow and pride of consciously influencing the destinies of mankind, much more than in the sense of personal reputation, that the delight of either poet or statesman chiefly consists." And Gibbon had at least the advantage of throwing himself into a controversy destined to endure for centuries. He, moreover, was specifically a historian, while Macaulay has been prized less as a historian proper, than as a master of literary art. Now a man of letters, in an age of battle and transition like our own, fades into an ever-deepening distance, unless he has while he writes that touching and impressive quality,—the presentiment of the eve; a feeling of the difficulties and interests that will engage and distract mankind on the morrow. Nor can it be enough for enduring fame in any age merely to throw a golden halo round the secularity of the hour, or to make glorious the narrowest limitations of the passing day. If we think what a changed sense is already given to criticism, what a different conception now presides over history, how many problems on which he was silent are now the familiar puzzles of even superficial readers, we cannot help feeling that the eminent man whose life we are all about to read, is the hero of a past which is already remote, and that he did little to make men better fitted to face a present of which, close as it was to him, he seems hardly to have dreamed.

EDITOR.

THE FINANCES OF INDIA.¹

THE finances of India may at this time have a special interest in Manchester (even beyond that which Manchester always takes in our Eastern Empire), because the possibility of effecting fiscal changes desired, and I may almost say demanded, by the manufacturers of this country must depend on the state of the finances. Before large sources of revenue can be abandoned, it must be shown either that the finances are so prosperous that the money can be spared, or that the income necessary for the public service can be raised in some other way.

In saying this I do not express any opinion of my own on the propriety of abolishing the duties on the import of manufactured goods. The Indian duties were certainly not imposed for purposes of protection, and they are very moderate in amount, not now in any case exceeding five per cent. Seeing the large revenue derived from the cotton duties, an independent ruler of India would probably not remit these duties. Still, I quite feel that in our administration of India it may fairly be expected that the fullest justice should be done not only to the people of India, but also to the manufacturers and people of this country. And I approach the subject looking to the fact that the views expressed in

(1) The present paper was prepared for, and, with some abbreviations to save time, read to the Manchester Chamber of Commerce in December last, in accordance with a wish which some of the leading men in the Chamber had been good enough to express. Indian financial affairs seem to have now an interest which may justify the publication of the paper. I should only like to add that I have seen with some surprise that public men in high position have ventured to speak of an entirely fictitious surplus of the last two years—a surplus which is only made out by eliminating altogether the famine charges, as well as the great public works, in a manner entirely arbitrary. The public accounts required by Parliament show, and can show, no such figures. I take, from a very recent official statement, the following account of surplus and deficit for the last six years, which will serve for reference in reading the following pages.

Year.	Surplus, exclusive of Public Works Extraordinary.	Surplus, inclusive of Public Works Extraordinary.	Deficit, exclusive of Public Works Extraordinary.	Deficit, inclusive of Public Works Extraordinary.
	£	£	£	£
1870-1	1,482,990	315,180	—	—
1871-2	3,124,177	1,495,703	—	—
1872-3	1,765,672	—	—	418,897
1873-4	—	—	1,807,668	5,360,975
1874-5 (regular estimate) }	—	—	494,489	4,526,592
1875-6 (budget estimate) }	506,000	—	—	3,794,000

Manchester have been in a sense accepted by the highest official authority, when Lord Salisbury gave it as his opinion that the duties must go as soon as the thing is possible. It is, then, at least time to consider whether the measure is, or probably soon will be, financially possible, and I confine myself to that question. I most strongly hold that the financial question must govern all others. It would be the gravest injustice to cause a deficit in the Indian finance.

I am myself all for prudence in matters of finance. I do not at all like the modern fashion of incurring great debts and trusting to the future for their repayment. But in India I go further than this. I am not content that in time of peace and prosperity we should make the two ends meet. I think that there is this most cardinal and essential difference between Indian finance and that of our own and other self-governing countries—that while we can appeal to the purses and patriotism of our own people to raise additional revenues in case of war or misfortune, in India the very opposite is the case. There, the harder we are pressed the more difficult, I may say impossible, we should find it to raise additional revenue. I must ask your very particular attention to this point, for I think it is one to which sufficient advertence has not been had. It is in time of peace and quiet that the taxes really necessary can safely be imposed, and the public may be habituated to them. In time of adversity it would be almost as much as our rule is worth to do any such thing. Consequently, in such times of need, if we have stored nothing in prosperity, there is nothing for it but to borrow, and to borrow in this country. I say that, under the circumstances of India, it is only prudent to create a good margin in time of peace, on which we may fall back in time of adversity.

The Indian populations are to an excessive degree creatures of habit. They do not so much object to taxation to which they are accustomed as to novelty in taxation. So long as a tax is new it is disliked in the extreme. But in a few years it ceases to be new, and, if not in itself very bad and vexatious, it is acquiesced in as part of the established and natural order of things.

Another difference between India as now governed and Europe I will allude to before going further. In a self-governed country it is often argued that not only are debts represented by real and good public improvements nothing more than a judicious expenditure of capital, but also they serve as sort of ballast to the state, in consequence of the interest in peace and good government of so many influential fundholders who cannot afford to suffer revolution and anarchy. Be this as it may, the case is widely different when, as of late in India, the borrowed money for the most part comes from the distant country of the governors, not from that of the governed. The amount remitted year by year from India to England is already

enormous. That amount is year by year increasing ; it must be a great source of eventual political weakness ; and to add to the amount by incurring fresh debts in England, even for useful purposes, is I submit very questionable policy. I am aware that the Government has taken this view, and has recently sought to raise loans in India rather than in England—we are even told that the last loan was mainly taken up by natives. But I understand that, under the English system of tenders by capitalists who resell to the public, this only means that native stockjobbers were even keener than Europeans for the chances of the market. We have no assurance that the stock is permanently held by the native public. Certainly the proportion held by natives is far less than in former days.

Yet the natives have great want of a secure investment for money, and had great faith in a Government annuity, though that faith was much shaken by some of our dealings during and after the Mutiny. I am not without regrets for the old system of open loans if money must be borrowed for public works. Formerly, when loans were open at a low rate, and natives could at any time put their money into the local Treasury without the intervention of a stockjobber, much native money flowed in in a quiet way.

With these preliminary remarks I come to the present condition of Indian finance. It has been the fashion with some people to describe it as extremely prosperous. In this I do not agree. I think that while much attention has been paid to economy, still much of the apparent improvement is the result of manipulating figures, and throwing expenses hitherto charged against income into the new head of "extraordinary," to be met by borrowing. Whether the present financial condition be sound or unsound, I do distinctly assert that it is less satisfactory than in some former periods ; that recent alleged surpluses on the "ordinary" account are not real surpluses ; and that, while the times are most prosperous, we are not making any sufficient provision against a rainy day. There is very little surplus on the account called "ordinary," and a large deficit on the extraordinary account.

In dealing with the matter I shall not trouble you with very numerous figures or with any very detailed calculations of my own. I shall take only the simplest and most recent figures presented to Parliament and published, as they appear in the last "Statistical Abstract relating to British India," and in "The Annual Report of the Progress and Condition of India."

First let us look at the debts which we have incurred, and see what we have to show for them. After a hundred years spent in the acquisition of the rule of all India, after many wars and many civil and commercial struggles, the East India Company reached the

year 1857, with a debt of about fifty millions—not a very large sum with so great an empire and all its fittings and appliances to show for it.

The Mutiny involved a very large expenditure and a very large debt, for the most part inevitable. And in another form the guaranteed railways have caused for a time a great increase of payments. I may say, however, that, so far as regards the trunk lines on Lord Dalhousie's plan, I consider the railways to be a distinct success. They already pay on the whole a very considerable interest on the sums expended. Several of the chief lines may now be deemed self-supporting or nearly so, and there is reasonable prospect that the whole annual loss will soon be reduced to figures which cannot be set against the vastly improved facilities which they directly afford for purposes of government, to say nothing of commercial advantages.

Looking to page 11 of the Statistical Abstract, I find that on 30th April, 1865, the total debt and obligations amounted to £98,475,555, while on the 31st March, 1874, the amount was £122,184,024, a difference of nearly twenty-four millions. Again in 1874-5 there has been a deficit, on the whole, of £4,526,592; and in the present year a large deficit is expected, according to the official statement, if all charges be included. There have been apparently some changes in the mode of account with respect to "obligations," some having been cancelled and others added; but I cannot doubt that our liabilities have been increased by at least some twenty-five millions sterling since 1865.

Now what have we to show for this deficit? Happily no great wars; the Empire has enjoyed almost uninterrupted peace and generally uninterrupted prosperity. The famines which have afflicted certain parts of the country are visitations which in one part of India or another may be traced in almost every decade. We must look for a justification, both for the deficit and for the failure of a proper saving for years of adversity, to the great public works which are supposed to justify the "extraordinary" head, under which the deficit is euphoniously veiled.

I fully admit that so far as Government undertakes works commercially remunerative works which might fairly be the task of private enterprise and which the Government assumes for peculiar political reasons, in such case the expenditure may be rightly kept apart as "extraordinary." But I think the "extraordinary" account should be confined to such cases; and when I was a member of the Council of India I most heartily concurred in a dispatch to the Government of India in which the Secretary of State strictly laid down the rule that the "extraordinary" expenditure was to be

absolutely confined to works *directly* remunerative—to those which may be confidently expected to pay the interest on the money borrowed by direct return to the Treasury. That principle had certainly not been previously followed, and I regret to say that I fear it has not since been followed to its full extent, and is not now followed. On the contrary, the last accounts from India show that the Viceroy has laid down an entirely different rule of his own. I believe that the order was not at all liked, and instead of complying, the Viceroy has substituted this rule. In effect he says: "Between the deficit on guaranteed railways and unpaying irrigation and other works, we already incur a loss of about two millions per annum; all we can undertake is not to increase that loss. But as one thing begins to pay, we hold ourselves free to embark in other unpaying schemes." The consequence is that, as fast as the really paying guaranteed railways are completed and brought into full work and begin to pay the full interest, the Indian Government holds itself free to charge to "extraordinary" works of a different character which never will pay. Thus the present loss of two millions per annum will be perpetuated, even if it is not increased.

In dealing with the finance, we must distinguish between general good supposed to be done to the country—a good which cannot be ascertained exactly in figures—and direct pecuniary return. From a strict financial point of view, we can look only to the latter; or, at most, we can only further take into account direct money savings to Government. It will not suffice to say, "Oh, true there is not direct pecuniary return, but the prosperity of the country leads to increase of revenue, and that recoups the Government." When I come to the main sources of revenue, I shall have to show that they are much less elastic than is generally supposed.

Again, then, I ask what have we to show for the deficit of the last ten years in the shape of works really yielding a direct profit sufficient to meet the interest on the money borrowed?

Well, the Government has taken over two or three very unpaying and insolvent concerns which private companies threw on its hands; it has built a good many very shaky barracks, many of which have proved very unsuitable; it has carried on several irrigation schemes; and it has made a commencement of several State railways. With respect to railways, the fact is that almost all the paying lines have been occupied by the guaranteed companies, and most of those taken up by the Government are the lines which are not likely to pay. Some were rejected by the companies as unprofitable. A great part of the Government lines are undertaken for political objects. I think the Northern Bengal line is the only one likely really to pay, and comparatively little has yet been spent on that. The irrigation works recently constructed or taken over

do not directly pay. I am aware that an official statement has been prepared by the Public Works Department to show that the canals do, as a whole, pay a certain moderate percentage. But departmental statements of this kind should be tested by independent authority. These figures are misleading in several ways. The old canals made by the native Governments are lumped up with recent canals which do not pay; the interest during construction is not taken into account; in some cases a portion of the land revenue is arbitrarily assigned to the canals. In spite of some evils, I do not doubt that the canals are in one way or other advantageous to the country. But there are difficulties, connected with the tenure of the land and otherwise, which must interfere with the prospect of direct profit. The subject is too large and difficult to enter on here. I will only say that it is principally in connection with the land revenue that real profit can be arrived at. If the *unearned increment* of the land is to come to the State, so may the indirect profit of irrigation railways and other public works, but not otherwise. Altogether, I do not think that above half the deficit of the last ten years can be attributed to works officially called reproductive; and I am sure that there is but a very small fraction of the whole expenditure which really pays fair interest on the money spent.

No doubt, on the statement which I have made, the argument commonly used suggests itself. It is said, "You admit that many of the works undertaken are in one shape or other beneficial to the country, is it not then good policy to borrow the money and make them?" I say, provided very great care and discrimination is used only to make really useful works, and not to follow the rush of opinion into works useful or useless, by all means make such works as you have money to make. The best guarantee for real care is the necessity of paying for them. And reverting to my view, that, situated as we are in India, we ought to save in time of prosperity, I say that the best way of investing such savings is in works which are really useful. I think, then, that the old Company's fashion of making works, which are thus indirectly beneficial, out of income, and not charging them to capital, was a good and sound one, which we may still with advantage follow. One of our Indian Finance Ministers (Mr. Massey, it was, I think) said with great truth that a large outlay on public works is an expenditure which may be retrenched at any time if necessity arises. I would have it then that we should so adjust our income and expenditure, that in time of peace and quiet we should have a clear annual surplus over inevitable expenditure of at least two or three millions per annum—I would myself rather say four or five millions—to provide for famines, great works, and everything else. I would quite approve the devoting of the surplus to works indirectly beneficial to the country, if we at the

same time keep a sufficient reserve to enable us to meet sudden emergencies without borrowing. I would not embark on works which cannot be thus met from revenue, excepting only in case of a clear and undoubted commercial investment, so likely to pay that a private capitalist would invest his money in it. A railway through a rich and populous part of India not yet provided for, and presenting no extraordinary engineering difficulties, would probably come under this last category; but, as a rule, neither our present State railways nor our recent irrigation works do.

We want, then, a surplus to enable us to meet unforeseen and extraordinary expenditure and great public works. What is our prospect of attaining that end? To deal with this part of the subject I must again glance back a little, and run over our Indian financial history in a very few words.

Under native rule the land revenue, pushed to a point almost or quite as high as rent—not unfrequently higher—is the mainstay of the finance. All other sources are merely subsidiary. These last took the shape of very frequent and vexatious transit duties, fees on trades and professions, fines, and extortions. From all these we have relieved the country. In lieu of the abolished transit duties we have imposed very moderate duties on most imports and on some exports. And we have created two great sources of revenue unknown to the natives—the opium revenue, which is practically an immense export duty, and the salt duty. Salt was subjected by the natives to petty duties like other articles; but in no native State, so far as I am aware, was it ever made the subject of very high duties and a special source of large revenue, such as it is to us. Our salt duty, though the people are now habituated to it, is distinctly a British as distinguished from a native tax. The excise on spirits and drugs, though much developed by us, had its beginning in the native system.

Stamps are merely a form of collecting revenue, and many kinds of revenue may be put under that head. In India stamps for the most part represent a tax on litigation, or perhaps it would be more proper to say fees to defray the cost of litigation. Recent apparent large increases in the stamp revenue are chiefly due to the transfer to stamps of large classes of court fees hitherto paid in cash. And so far as the increase is real there has been at least a corresponding increase in the cost of the courts. I would then hardly class stamps as a real source of revenue, a comparatively small receipt from light stamps on commercial documents excepted.

Our really effective Indian revenue is derived from five sources—land, opium, salt, excise, and customs—of which land yields somewhat more than all the others put together.

Down to the time of the Mutiny, the Company managed to carry

on the administration, including public works, from these sources. After the Mutiny, India had for a short time the benefit of the services of that very able financier the late Mr. James Wilson. Mr. Wilson considered, and I am inclined to think justly considered, that the altered circumstances of our position in the country, due to the discovery that we could no longer rely on a cheap native army, rendered necessary an increase of income. He imposed fresh taxation, notably the income-tax, also a large addition to the customs duties, some addition to the salt duty, and some other imposts. After the war came prosperity; very large amounts of English capital (borrowed, guaranteed, and private) were poured into the country. Partly as the result of this prosperity, and partly by the new plan of throwing off public works on extraordinary loans, it has been found possible to get rid of most of the additional taxation imposed by Mr. Wilson. It has been assumed that all the surplus of times of prosperity and something more can be applied to remission of taxation. In this way the whole of the new imposts affecting the rich and well-to-do—the income-tax, the enhanced customs duties, &c.—have been done away with; only that affecting the poor, the salt duty, has been maintained and further aggravated. In my opinion that is a very great injustice.

To see the course of Indian finance in the last ten years let us turn to pages 7 and seq. of the Statistical Abstract.

The prosperity subsequent to the Mutiny culminated in a considerable surplus in 1866. But very large sums were then spent on public works not always the most prudent. The military charges were still very high. There was a heavy deficit in the years 1868 and 1869, which much alarmed the Government of the late Lord Mayo. Stringent measures of retrenchment and some measures of taxation were resorted to, including a sudden increase of the income-tax in the middle of the year, which created more hubbub among the richer classes than perhaps it was worth.

Lord Mayo was a true friend of the people, and he had nothing more at heart than the mitigation of the salt duty in those parts of India where it pressed most heavily. It was mainly with this object that he clung to the income-tax. This he states very plainly in his minutes, and on that ground the income-tax was maintained at a moderate rate to the end of his reign.

Another very important measure of Lord Mayo's Government was the localisation of a portion of the finance. He desired to regulate the increase of the growing departments, so far as they were of a local character and dependent on local arrangements, views, and management, by giving to each local Government once for all a permanent grant slightly reduced from the grant of recent years, and calling on them to find all further sums that might be

required for the improvement of those departments from local sources. It is quite clear that Lord Mayo's Government contemplated possible fresh taxation by the provincial Governments in case the necessity arose and fitting means approved by the supreme Government could be devised. More especially Lord Mayo sought to restore local municipal institutions, and to promote among the people both a desire for improvements of which they directly reaped the benefit and a self-reliance founded on the necessity of paying for such improvements by local rates. This view was much pressed on the local Governments, and plans in that direction were taking shape when Lord Mayo died. The result of Lord Mayo's measures was that a surplus was again established. On the 31st March, 1872, a few weeks before the arrival of his successor, the accounts showed a surplus on the year of close on a million and a half sterling, all extraordinary disbursements included.

This prosperous state of things has since been very much altered, partly by remission of taxation and partly by extraordinary demands on the Treasury. In my opinion Lord Northbrook came to India too much inclined to the view, set about by those who most make themselves heard in India and accepted by many earnest men at home, that the people of India have been overburdened by recent attempts at direct and other taxation. I think he has too much put forward remission of taxation as the object to be aimed at, as distinguished from adjustment of taxation and the establishment of a safe balance. I think too much has been conceded to the rich and noisy, and too little to the poor. The income-tax has been abolished and some other concessions have been made, but the salt-tax remains unabated.

Following on Lord Northbrook's too confident reductions of taxation came the famine and some other demands. The surplus of 1871-2 gave place to a large deficit, which reached the sums of £5,360,975 in 1873-4, and £4,526,592 in 1874-5, extraordinary expenses included as in the previous account.

Since the famine-expenditure has ceased, the Government cannot hold out any better prospect than an equilibrium, to be attained if it is permitted to borrow for works called "extraordinary," and to keep them out of the account. The estimates for the present year show that, if no misfortune or unexpected charge of any kind occurs, if we have continued prosperity without war or famine, the Government expects a surplus of £506,000 only on the ordinary account, and a deficit of £3,794,000 if the extraordinary account be included. Since these estimates were framed we have very narrowly escaped a serious complication in Burmah, and I understand that there is again a scarcity in Behar, for which considerable expenses may possibly be incurred.

It is also the case that the expenditure on works *not* classed as "extraordinary" is much less than it was some years ago. Some of the provincial authorities complain that many improvements have been stopped in consequence of the famine in Bengal, and the Commander-in-Chief is aggrieved that military works are not carried forward as rapidly as in former years. The present estimates are the result of a somewhat severe economy in everything not classed as extraordinary.

Lord Mayo's plan of throwing on provinces and localities the burden of providing for local benefits by local taxes and rates has also been checked. The local Governments have not devised any new provincial taxation which commended itself to the Government of India. Some plans of the kind, proposed by the Government of Bombay, were, I believe rightly, negatived. The present Viceroy, in effect, broadly announced that no new taxes, imperial or provincial, would be sanctioned.

Lord Northbrook much discouraged all municipal arrangements which might result in taxation in any shape. An Act of the Bengal Legislature for reconstituting rural municipalities in Bengal, with permissive powers of rating in a very limited way, for sanitation, education, and other improvements, was vetoed by him on the ground that it might possibly lead to increase of taxation. I think it was hardly taken into account that in native times there is a very large self-imposed local taxation by the members of the village communities for their own objects.

One great experiment in local taxation for local purposes has been carried through, and I think I may presume to say that it is now on all hands admitted that it has been attended with extraordinary and unexpected success. I allude to the Bengal Road leep. I had the duty, on assuming the government of Bengal, of considering this subject, in accordance with Lord Mayo's wishes and those of the Secretary of State; and, with the assistance of men very experienced in the affairs of Bengal, I framed a measure which was passed by the Bengal Legislative Council, and received the assent of Lord Mayo. That measure also received the approval of the then Secretary of State, before the change of financial policy occurred in India, and was experimentally introduced in several districts. Lord Northbrook, for a time, looked on it with much suspicion, and prohibited its further extension; but I am bound to say that eventually he fairly permitted me to carry out the policy which had been sanctioned by her Majesty's Government, and gave me an honest support. The result has been that in the districts in which I tried it, rates imposed by local bodies for the construction and maintenance of local roads have been collected with a success which I may call astonishing. The system has been accepted almost without

a grumble, and the people seem quite sensible of the benefits which they are to derive from it. So completely is this admitted, that Sir R. Temple has proposed, and Lord Northbrook has sanctioned, the extension of the system to almost all the remaining districts of Bengal.

This, then, brings our finance down to the present time. The income-tax and salt-tax apart, I do not think it can properly be said that we have subjected the people of India to severe taxation. So far from the land revenue being a heavy tax imposed by us, we have, by leaving a large margin to the proprietors whom we have established, created in their favour a vast and valuable property, which in this sense never existed before. The opium revenue is not paid by the people of India. The incidence of the customs and excise is very light. The richer natives are certainly among the most lightly-taxed people in the world. On the poor the salt-tax amounts to a poll-tax of about 8*d.* per head if we take the whole population of India, men, women, and children, together; but as the tax is paid in advance by the wholesale dealer, and is attended with many restrictions, it probably costs the consumers something near 1*s.* per head—say 5*s.* per family—that is, about 4 per cent. on the income of a labouring man earning 5 rupees or 10*s.* per month. In certain provinces, the duty being heavier, the incidence of the tax is much heavier.

Notwithstanding what I have said, I have never committed myself to advocate the continuance of the income-tax as an imperial tax. The decision has not rested with me, and I have suspended my judgment. It was my duty to collect the tax, and this I can say, that it has never been well assessed or put on a satisfactory footing. It was very roughly assessed at first—more successfully, however, than might have been expected. Since then the Government has never fully faced the question of making the tax a permanent resource. It has been continued from time to time. This has been conceded and that to those who are aggrieved. Much complaint was thus appeased, but the income was more and more attenuated. It was quite necessary either to take the tax in hand, readjust it, and impose it properly, or to abandon it. The plan to which I inclined was to localise it, throwing certain burdens on localities and giving them the income-tax to manipulate in their own way. At any rate I have said, and will continue to say, that while no relief was given to the poor, the tax should not have been taken off the rich without finding a substitute for it.

However, the income-tax has gone, and Indian finance is, as it were, reduced to its original elements—the old-fashioned sources of income which existed before the Mutiny. Do these old-fashioned sources give promise of increase sufficient to meet an expenditure

which inevitably increases, and to provide for those things which I have tried to show that prudence requires? That I must examine.

I have stated the five sources of real revenue—land, opium, salt, excise, and customs. I will go over them seriatim.

The Indian land revenue is one of those subjects about which one feels that the further one goes the more difficult it is. After having, I may almost say, devoted myself to the subject for upwards of thirty years, I have hardly arrived at confident conclusions. My views have been opposed to a permanent settlement, in the form at least in which we know it. I have inclined to the maintenance of the native system, under which, in one shape or other, almost the whole rent comes to the State, and is the public fund by which the functions of Government are carried on. Under that system the customary rents are either collected by the State direct or taken through middlemen who receive a percentage for their trouble and whose tenure is contingent on their good behaviour.

So long as this system is maintained, strong ideas regarding the rights of property in land do not arise. While we administer the native system without native tyranny and caprice, small farmers who hold with perfect security of tenure, so long as they pay moderate rents, are well content; and the middleman who retains his functions and his percentage, so long as he performs his duties honestly and efficiently, quite accepts the situation.

But once landed property in the English form is created, things become very different. When estates have acquired a marketable value, and are bought and sold, very strong interests arise, which energetically resist the increase of revenue at the will of the State officials. And under a system which gives the rich and influential great power in the press, and great means of swaying public opinion, it becomes more and more difficult to keep the Government revenue up to its former scale. Even where Government deals direct with the ryots, the classes which formerly contentedly paid a full rent, so soon as they have become accustomed to a property giving a large margin of income, against which they can borrow and spend, greatly resent any sudden and serious reduction of that income. In Lord Cornwallis's time the Zameindar had only 10 per cent. of the revenue, and he performed gratuitously many duties for which we now pay heavily. Later on the rule was laid down that the proprietors should keep one-third of the rent, paying two-thirds to Government, and on that basis the settlements were concluded for thirty years. Since then peace, prosperity, and public works have done much for the country, the value of the land and the free income of the proprietors has greatly increased. The State now demands only half the rent. Even that half should be more than

the two-thirds of former days. But the men who have till now paid only the light assessment made in a former generation, and who have learned to spend and borrow and mortgage on the strength of the large income accruing to them, feel bitterly a revision of assessment which diminishes their free income. There is more and more cry for "consideration" and "moderation of assessments." The land revenue does not increase in proportion to the increased value of the country; the indirect benefit of railways and canals is not fully reaped by the State. True, up to this time considerable additions have been made to the assessments in some provinces, and frequent accessions of territory have contributed to swell the land revenue; but further accessions of territory we do not now look for, and there is at present a strong tendency to reaction against increased assessments. On the whole, notwithstanding my long-standing partiality for the old system of retaining the rent as the State fund and so avoiding other taxation, I begin to think that we shall come to a permanent settlement in one shape or other. I fear that, as things are now going, we neither obtain an increase of revenue proportioned to the increased value of the land and our increased expenses, nor do we give that security against variable assessments at the will of the Government which seems to be requisite to a fair trial of the English system of property in land. If I had absolute power, perhaps I might still revert to the old system; but to do so would be little short of a revolution; and unless potent forces bring that about, I am coming to the belief that we shall have to accept a permanent settlement and look to other forms of taxation.

By a permanent settlement I mean one under which the payments are at least regulated by a fixed scale, and no longer depend on the will of the Government, nor on rents which may some day to some extent represent the investment of capital. The best compromise is probably that which would give for ever a revenue of the character of grain rents, that is payments to be regulated every few years by the price of the staple articles of production.

To derive real social and political benefit from such a fixity of assessment, the measure must not be limited to the highest class connected with the land, but must extend to all the lower grades of persons having a real interest in the soil. There is no so great source of weakness to us as the necessity of maintaining weak landlords against energetic sub-holders deprived of the sacred right of rebellion. For instance, in my view, our only danger from what is called Mahommedan fanaticism is in cases where religion is merely used as a bond to unite a peasantry who believe that they have agrarian grievances. It would be necessary to make some special provision for the effect of Government irrigation works.

For the present I am convinced that, in the absence of any

revolution in our land policy, we have already obtained and taken credit for almost all the increase of land revenue that we are likely to get for some time to come. Most of our present settlements must now run for twenty or thirty years, and so far from a general prospect of early increase, there is, on the contrary, a great disposition to reduce settlements made when the price of cotton was high and agricultural affairs at high tide. Several such reductions have lately been sanctioned. It seems now to be established that the Americans have succeeded in placing their cotton cultivation on as high a footing as before the war. I fear India cannot rival American cotton in quality. It so happens that cotton is not only our most valuable export, but is produced in the districts where we have the greatest power to raise the revenue as the value of produce increases. The rice and jute and other great exports of Bengal and parts of Madras, indeed I may say the bulk of our exports from that side of India, and those most capable of development, come from permanently settled provinces, where no increase of land revenue is possible. I say advisedly that, in revising our finances, we must not count on further rapid increase of the land revenue at present.

Next in financial order stands the opium revenue. We have the highest official authority for the view that we ought not to rely on the permanence of this branch of our revenue. Lord Mayo thought so; recent and present Secretaries of State have declared so. Yet there is a comfortable under-current of belief that the opium revenue has continued to increase in spite of all sinister forebodings, and that it may well continue still to increase and flourish. So long as the political circumstances remain as they are, it may well be that, despite occasional fluctuations, our opium revenue may be maintained. But I am very deliberately of opinion that it will not continue to develop as it has in past years, and I will explain why.

The increase of the indigenous cultivation in China is now beyond doubt. Yet it may be that the unhappy spread of a taste for the drug among the Chinese population would leave room enough both for the inferior indigenous and for the superior foreign drug. If we could have supplied it at the price which was formerly thought the safest, that is at 1,000 or 1,100 rupees per chest, we might have held our own in the competition, and we should still have levied, in practice, an export duty of nearly 200 per cent. This was the policy at which Lord Mayo's Government aimed. It was intended to increase the quantity of Indian opium supplied so as to keep down the price to a level, which would compete advantageously with the Chinese and all other opiums. And no doubt, looking at the matter commercially, this was the right policy. But it turns out that the attempt to extend the

production has been unsuccessful; it almost looks as if we had reached the limits of our powers in that way, unless inducements are held out such as would much detract from the profit. Instead of an average of 60,000 chests of Bengal opium as was intended, we have only got about 45,000 chests. Consequently the price has gone up very much. From the smaller quantity we have made more than we expected to make from the larger quantity. The immediate financial effect has been favourable. If there were no competition this would be an excellent result. But the fear is that the high prices of the last few years are killing the goose that lays the eggs. These prices are giving a very great stimulus to the growth in China; and even if we still sell our drug well, I do not think that with our present production the revenue can continue to increase; we shall be very lucky if we maintain it at the high level of recent years. This is supposing political conditions to remain as they are. But there are dangers which cannot be concealed. There is not only the danger of open war with China, but there is the possibility that China may become strong enough to take her own way in this matter; to say, "We always have objected to this trade, and we are determined to put a stop to it." There is the possibility that the conscience of England may be awakened by those who take a strong view of this matter till the country says, "We will not force opium on the Chinese; they may do as they like." Finally, after the experience of the potato and the vine, we must always feel that a highly centralised cultivation of a single plant continued year after year and generation after generation in the same districts is very liable to be interrupted by great blights. We have had some rather alarming appearances among the poppy plants of late years, and cannot but take into account that a blight might upset all our opium revenue.

I come to the conclusion, then, that, if all goes well, we may hope to retain our opium revenue, but cannot look to increase it rapidly as it has heretofore increased. At the same time, that revenue is one peculiarly exposed to risks by which it may be lost, and we certainly ought not to calculate too confidently on it.

I have seen the salt-duty triumphantly instanced as a revenue progressive in a most gratifying degree. How far this is true a brief statement at page 39 of the last "Moral and Material Progress Report" enables us to judge. True, the revenue has doubled since the Mutiny, but most of the increase is due to the increased taxation which a stricter and more organised system has enabled us to impose. In the period from 1857 to 1874, which the compiler of the report takes, the rate of salt duty in Madras and Bombay has been much more than doubled; in the North-West Provinces and Punjab it has been increased 50 per cent.; and in Bengal it has been

increased 30 per cent. We must look to the quantity consumed. The compiler says that there has been an increase in the quantity on which duty is paid of about 16 per cent. in seventeen years. Now in that time the whole of Oude (which not only made its own salt, but smuggled largely into our districts) has been brought within our salt customs system; also several other districts. The manufacture of earth salt in several parts of India has been put down. A more complete authority and system have enabled us nearly to put down the wholesale and violent smuggling across the internal salt line which used to prevail. Making all these deductions from an increase of 16 per cent. on the whole, I do not think it can be said that the increase in the consumption of salt has gone beyond the natural increase of population, but quite the contrary. We have succeeded in raising heavier salt duties, but all the increased facilities of carriage and trade have not sufficed to lead to real increase of consumption in the face of the increased duties. Accustomed to a salt duty as the people are, it is nevertheless attended with many disadvantages. I have shown that it is, in fact, a heavy poll-tax on the poor—heavier than any income-tax that we have imposed on the rich. It limits the consumption by the people of a necessary of life and health, and it almost entirely prevents the use of salt for cattle. It is also rendered impossible to use salt for the purposes of curing; and no one who has observed how much dried fish enters into the food of the people of Bengal and other parts of India, and how offensive it is when dried without salt, can doubt that this is a great evil. Still, if the salt duty is to be maintained as a large source of income, I cannot doubt that recent increases in the Madras and Bombay duty are justified as a step towards equalisation. In those Presidencies Government salt is now sold at the rate of two rupees, or 4s. per maund of 80 lbs., which means that it is charged with a duty of about 3s. 6d. per maund. In Bengal the duty is 6s. 6d. per maund, and the sale price at place of debarkation about 8s. per maund; and in the North-West Provinces and Punjab the duty is nearly as high. It was Lord Mayo's intention to use the additional revenue obtained in Madras and Bombay in order to let down the duty in Northern India, where it presses with undue severity and reduces the consumption far below that prevailing in other parts of India. In my opinion that is the right course. The salt revenue, instead of being further increased, should be somewhat diminished.

The excise revenue derived from spirits and drugs now amounts to about £2,300,000 gross. The system lately followed has been to increase the rate of tax, although we thereby diminish the quantity on which duty is paid, the object being to derive the largest revenue from the smallest consumption. And this policy has been very successful. I think that the excise revenue may be expected to gain in propor-

tion to the wealth and population of the country. But it is only a minor source of income, and God forbid that we should so spread a taste for drinking as to give it a great position in our finance.

There remains the customs, in which you are particularly interested. The whole customs duties were before the late changes about £2,600,000, of which about two-thirds were derived from imports and about one-third from exports. Lord Northbrook has abandoned upwards of £300,000¹ of this revenue. Of the remainder about £900,000 is directly derived from the duties on cotton goods, the abolition of which you demand, and about £400,000 from wines and liquors, which must remain so long as there is an excise on those articles. I have no doubt it would be found that there are many other goods so much connected with or affiliated to the cotton trade, that if the cotton duties go they must go too—so that, in fact, the bulk of our import duties would be gone. I do not think the duties on metals are politic, and they, too, are so far protective. A successful iron manufacture on European methods may any day spring up. My impression is that if the cotton duties go all import duties except those on articles on which an excise is levied in India must go. Then the remaining export duties on grain, indigo, and lac must go, and we shall have complete free trade except in salt and spirituous liquors. That is, I dare say, a consummation very much to be desired; but it involves the loss of upwards of two millions of revenue, which must be replaced somehow.

We have so little information, that I am hardly prepared to speak of the late changes in the customs introduced by Lord Northbrook's Government. I do not at all understand why it was necessary to do so without giving either the independent members of the Viceroy's Council and the Indian public on the one hand, or the Secretary of State and his Council on the other, any opportunity of saying a word on the matter. I do not quite see why some import duties were reduced without any urgent demand, while the cotton duties, which you may force the Government to abandon, remain. The import duty on American cotton seems fair enough in itself, but raises difficult questions without really settling anything, and has caused much irritation. The abolition of a number of the export duties on articles of which we have no monopoly was I think right.

I have now gone over the sources of the Indian revenue. What I have said will have shown that I do not think it likely to increase greatly by mere natural development for some time to come.

Can we diminish the charges? I think not. The fact is that, putting aside the policy of abandoning some of the sources of revenue without a substitute, the ordinary finances of India have been very

(1) Gross remissions, £408,000; net ditto, £308,000; [£100,000 being gained on spirits and wines.

well and carefully administered for some years past, with great regard to economy. Almost all possible retrenchments have been made, and little remains to do in that direction. On the other hand, prices continue to rise while the value of silver falls; and there are many things in which there must be a progressive increase of expenditure, due both to what may be called natural growth and to the ever-increasing demands of an improved administration. New wants and demands are continually developed, and must be met if we are to keep pace with modern standards. This tendency is already apparent. Notwithstanding all the watchful care of Lord Northbrook, the last accounts show that it has been necessary to concede a considerable increase of expenditure in several branches and on the whole. The increase of expenditure in the estimates for the present year is upwards of a million; and even if we attribute half of that excess to exceptional causes connected with guaranteed railways and exchange, there is still an increase in army and other charges amounting to about half a million, which marks an increasing expenditure not to be avoided.

The great item of charge is the army, in which, after many reductions and economies have been made, there is now an increase on the last estimates, and in respect of which there is a very strong demand for improvements involving further increase of charge. Whether anything ought to be conceded to the cry for more European officers for the native army I will not say—I rather hope not; but there is little doubt that some increase must be conceded in the pay of the native soldiers. Both the gradual rise of wages in the labour market and recent changes in the system of the British army in the direction of short service (which will necessitate the offering special terms for service in India) must make the European soldier a continually increasing expense. The cost of modern arms and appliances also continually increases. I fear that, the numbers remaining the same, we cannot hope to avoid some gradual increase in the cost of the army. I am very clear that the numbers of the army cannot be reduced. We have 180,000 men all told, including sick, men on furlough, and non-effectives of every kind. We have no militia or reserves of any sort. Such a force, for so enormous a country, with so great a population, and so many native states with armies of their own, is smaller in proportion than almost any army in the world. It cannot be reduced. In truth, when we deduct from a force of say 150,000 effectives the men absolutely required for the enormous number of garrisons and guards, which are indispensable throughout the length and breadth of so great a country held by a foreign rule, the number that we could collect in any one army in the field is wonderfully small, judged by any European standard. We cannot put out of sight the fact that political complications may

arise, and I do not think we can avoid in our calculations the possible contingency of an increase of the army in India rendered necessary by such circumstances. My fear of Russia and the Central Asia Question is not that we need entertain serious apprehensions of a collision on the north-west frontier for a generation at least, but that the advance of Russia and the feelings on the subject excited in this country may drive us to precautionary measures which will increase our military charges and very unfavourably affect our finances. On the side of Egypt also complications may arise. We won't say more of that now. Burmah is a country where we have one foot, but not both, and any serious difficulty involving an advance there would render necessary the occupation of a very large territory. Beyond Burmah is China, and unfortunately there are many indications that serious questions with China may not be distant. Altogether, I greatly fear that it is impossible to make our finance safe and prudent without allowance for the not improbable event of increased military charges from one cause or another.

The marine charges, too, have been reduced to a point so low that an increase has been found indispensable, even if demands are not made on behalf of the British navy.

In the civil charges, again, I do not think we can expect further savings. If here and there something can be saved, the gain will be more than absorbed by the demands for modern improvements to which I have alluded. The charges connected with the administration of justice are always increasing; additions to the pay of native judges, extensions to meet increasing and more complicated litigation, and other demands, cause the increase. Hitherto this increase has been met by increase in the stamp revenues, and I set one off against the other. But we have perhaps pushed to extreme the anti-Benthamite principle of making litigation pay for itself. The stamp duties charged on legal proceedings have been increased, and it was supposed to be a good thing to discourage litigation. To take a good slice of the proceeds of litigation from the successful suitor is quite in accordance with native tradition and custom. We charge the suitor at his entrance to the hall of justice. But it may be doubted if the end we desire to attain is really achieved. In India litigation is both the excitement and luxury of the rich, and the means by which the poor are coerced. The rich man willingly pays the fees required for the privilege of going into court. But there has been of late very much reason to fear that the taxes imposed in classes of cases in which the poor are especially interested, and which were formerly almost free, have led to serious denial of justice. It has been necessary to make some relaxation in these cases, and further concessions may be necessary.

The sum of my views on the financial situation in India is this.

The great attention given to finance by the late and present Viceroys and the careful economies effected by them had this effect, that if taxation had been maintained at the point where Lord Mayo left it there would now have been, as a little time ago there was, a surplus of about two millions on the ordinary and regular expenditure, famines and other contingencies apart, and some really paying or what we may call mercantile works being charged to a separate capital account. Famines and extraordinary civil demands might have been met from the surplus, but not wars and the great works which do not pay. Lord Northbrook's remissions of taxation have reduced the margin to half a million according to the last accounts—so that we have now really no considerable margin over the regular allotted and certain expenditure to meet famines and other contingencies and defray the cost of great works. I say that we must calculate on the occasional occurrence of famines and other unascertained contingencies and expenses. I say that as we are situated, we ought in time of peace form a reserve fund to meet probable political complications and possible military operations. I say that the greater proportion of the public works now charged as “extraordinary” will not yield to Government a net return to pay the interest accruing on the money borrowed, and that therefore it is not safe or right, financially speaking, to charge such works to capital. And with these views I argue that a mere equilibrium between the receipts and ascertained ordinary charges is not sufficient—that a large margin should be provided.

I further express the opinion that we have made the most of our present sources of revenue, and are not likely in the years to come to derive from them large and rapid increase of income. Some of the chief of our resources are, I think, subject to risk of diminution by external circumstances or exposed to just demands for abatement. I apprehend that continual increase of charges which has been found to be inevitable. In short, I think our expenditure is more likely to increase than our income and in greater proportion. At best, even if we hold our own under the present system, I see no prospect of that margin over ordinary expenditure to meet occasional demands and public works which I think necessary.

Five years ago I had occasion to review the finances of India. I then expressed opinions very similar to those which I now hold. I have been looking over the figures, and I think they confirm the views I held then and hold now. The revenues have increased with extreme slowness in the last five years and, after two millions of assessed taxes given up, the estimated receipts of 1875-6 are a million and a half less than in 1870-1, being only £49,800,000 against £51,413,000 in the former year. The expenses including extraordinary are, on the other hand, upwards of two and a half millions in excess of the

former year—£53,600,000 to £51,000,000—and our financial condition is thus upwards of four millions worse. The public works, ordinary and extraordinary together, stand at £5,200,000 in 1870-1, £7,200,000 in 1875-6; so that the State railways may account for half the difference and the remission of taxation for the other half. There has been little gain in other quarters to set against that remission, and we have a large deficit on the whole instead of a small surplus.

What, then, is to be done? I confess that in my view it is not possible to make the financial reforms which successive heads of the administration have held to be desirable—to mitigate the salt-tax on the poor, or to remit the customs duties which have to some extent a protective effect—without increasing our resources from some quarter. I do not think it safe to go on as at present, relegating expenditure to an “extraordinary” account, without some such adjustment.

If it be conceded that increased means must be found, then I think we must choose between two courses—increase of the land revenue, or taxation in other shapes. Either we must revert to the native view of land management, taking the bulk of the rent for the State, and leaving to the occupants and middlemen merely a privileged occupancy and a fair remuneration for the duties of collection and management; or, if we keep to the English view of property according to modern patterns, then we must also introduce modern forms of taxation, and so redress the balance. I do not take upon myself to say which course should be adopted, for I do not think it in practice probable that we really shall adopt and firmly carry out the former course; and therefore I apprehend that it probably will be necessary to revert to the course which our post-Mutiny financiers, from Mr. Wilson to Lord Mayo, have adopted, but which Lord Northbrook has abandoned—that is, the imposition of some taxes in addition to those which sufficed before the Mutiny. I think they should be taxes on the rich and well-to-do more especially. Those taxes may be imperial, provincial, or local. I strongly hold that the reforms you desire cannot be effected without them. I do not now go further into the question. I have only indicated to you what I believe to be our position.

It is not possible that I should enter on the machinery of government by which the finances of India are managed and controlled. That is a very large and separate subject. I may say, however, that I think there is a want of any one centralised authority, and of any continuity of policy and system, by which great results might be worked out. We seem too much to drift with the tide, or to follow the changing opinions of individuals high in office.

Nominally, according to the letter of the law, a very great power

over the finances is vested in the Council of India in this country. But in practice much of this power is illusory, and the Council does not fully exercise any real power that it has. A Viceroy who has views of his own may sometimes carry them out without much regard to the Home Government. For instance, it is certain that Lord Northbrook thought proper to make the late changes in the customs arrangements without giving the least information to the Home Government, so that the Indian Council had no opportunity whatever of expressing their views or exercising any influence one way or other.

Again, although no expenditure can be sanctioned by the Secretary of State without the consent of his Council, he might in the Secret department direct the Viceroy to enter into a war, or to make military or political dispositions involving enormous charges or enormous sacrifices, entirely without the knowledge of the Council. Telegrams, too, seem in practice exempt from the control of the Council; and in other ways, when there is a complete understanding between the Viceroy and the Secretary for State, much influence may be exercised without formal orders passing before the Council.

Even as regards those things in which the Council might have real power, its members have little cohesion as a body, and I think it is generally felt by the members of the Council themselves that they do not stand so firmly on opinions of their own and exercise that substantial control over expenditure which the Legislature seems to have contemplated.

I think the periodical overhaul of the Indian machine which took place while the Company existed was beneficial in many ways; and now that a considerable period has elapsed since the Crown assumed the Government, the time is approaching when another overhaul would be very desirable.

G. CAMPBELL.

DUTCH GUIANA.¹

CHAPTER V.

BUSH - NEGROES.

THE groups that had gathered to greet us as we landed at the large wooden "stelling" in front of La Paix, had an appearance not unbefitting the general character of the place itself. Mixed together, yet distinct, the slender ornament-circled limbs and cringing gestures of the turbaned Coolies by the wharf, contrasted strangely with the sturdy forms and independent demeanour of the Bush-negroes, here present in great force, mixed up with the more disciplined Creoles, many of whom were, however, scarcely more over-burdened with apparel—or, rather, sensible of the want of it—than their Maroon kinsmen around. There was no lack of that general good feeling and willing subordination that characterized the more civilised population nearer the capital; all were cheerful—the Coolies, perhaps, excepted, but cheerfulness is not a Hindoo virtue either at home or abroad—and courteous, after a fashion, but somewhat wild.

A painted four-oar-boat, with its commodious stern-cabin—the overseer's conveyance—lay alongside the wharf; two broad, flat-bottomed barges were moored some way up the main creek that leads to the interior of the estate; and besides these were a dozen Maroon corials, mere hollow tree-trunks, the simplest forms of barbaric invention—survivals, to borrow Mr. Tylor's excellent nomenclature, of a pre-civilised era in river navigation.

The owners of the corials—tall, well-shaped men of colour, ranging between dark brown and inky black, with a rag at most bound turban-fashion round their bullet heads, and another of scarce ampler dimensions about their loins—muster on the landing-place, and salute the Governor with a courteous deference to which the fullest uniform could add nothing. The women, whose dress may best be described as a scanty kilt, and the children, boys and girls, who have none to describe, keep somewhat in the background—laughing, of course; all seem perfectly at home, without strangeness, or even shyness of any kind. Nor, indeed, are they strangers from far off; their villages, on the banks of the upper Cottica itself, and of its tributary stream, the Coermotibo, are almost contiguous to the European estates. The main body of the tribe is, however, far away on the banks of the Saara River to the South, where their chief resides, and along the

(1) See *Fortnightly Review* for December, 1875, and February, 1876.]

west bank of the Maraweyn, the boundary river between Dutch and French Guiana. All this vast region, said by the few explorers who have visited it to be in no respect inferior for its fertility and the variety of its products to the best lands of Surinam, has been made over, partly by express treaty, partly by custom, to the Maroons, commonly known as the Bush-negroes, the first who in 1761 obtained a formal recognition of freedom and independence from their European masters. Of the entire district they are now almost the sole occupants, undisturbed even by dark-skinned competitors; for the Indian aborigines, believed to have been once numerous throughout these wooded valleys, have wasted away and disappeared, unable not merely to compete but even to co-exist with their African any better than with their European neighbours. A small Dutch settlement—that of Albina, on the banks of the Maroweyn—alone varies the uniformity of negro possession in these lands.

Their mode of life is agricultural; their labour is partly bestowed on the field-produce sufficient to their own personal wants, partly on the growth and export of rice, with which they supply the estates and the capital. But their chief occupation is wood-cutting, and their skill in this department has secured them an almost absolute monopoly of the timber supply that forms a considerable item in the trade-lists of Surinam. They hew, trim, divide the planks, and do whatever is requisite for preparing the wood for shipment; then bring it down in the form of rafts or boat-loads to Paramaribo, where they exchange it most commonly for arms, powder, cooking utensils, and other household necessities. Fortunately for themselves, strong drink is not a favourite article of barter among these unregistered and unbaptized disciples of Father Mathew and Sir Wilfrid Lawson. Indeed, in this, as in many other respects, they present an advantageous contrast with the besotted Indians, whose diminution and almost disappearance from the land has been occasioned by intemperance much more than by any of the numerous causes assigned on philo-indigenous platforms. With the negro, on the contrary, drunkenness is an exotic vice, and even where it has been implanted it does not flourish largely on his soil.

Their settlements, far up among the rivers, and in regions said to be admirably adapted for cultivation, though as yet rarely favoured by European visitors, are grouped together after the fashion of small villages, resembling, I am told, in their principal features the more accessible hamlet inhabited by emancipated Congo Africans, and called "Bel Air," near Berbice. Their dwellings are reported to be neat and comfortable enough after a fashion. About fifty of these villages are recorded by name; the average number of souls in each equals three hundred, or thereabouts. The census of the entire Bush-negro population is almost conjectural; some bring their

numbers down to eight thousand, others raise them to thirty. Of the two extremes the latter is, I believe, the nearest to the truth. Negroes, like other Eastern tribes, when required to give an account of themselves, are in the habit of reckoning up their men only, omitting the women altogether, and even the male children if still at the breast. Fear of taxation is another common motive for understatement, especially in the presence of official inquiry. Every village has its chief; his office is partly hereditary, partly elective, and he himself is distinguished from his subjects by a uniform, to be worn, however, only on rare and special occasions—a fortunate circumstance in so warm a climate. He also bears a staff of office. These lesser chiefs are, again, under the orders of the headman of the tribe, who has right to wear, when he chooses—a rare occurrence, let us hope—a general's uniform, and to bear in his hand a bâton of rule surmounted by a gilded knob.

Besides the "grand man" of their own "skin," in negro phrase, each tribe enjoys or endures the presence of a European official whom the Colonial Government appoints under the title of "Postholder," to reside among them, and whose duties chiefly consist in settling the frequent petty contentions that arise between the villagers themselves or their neighbours, regarding rights of property or land. Most other cases, civil or criminal, fall under the jurisdiction of the tribe itself, and are decided by the unwritten code of usage—often sufficiently barbarous in the punishments that it awards; though the cruellest of all, that of burning alive, is said not to have been inflicted on any one for a generation past. It was the penalty especially reserved for sorcerers, and its discontinuance is attributed to the fact that the sorcerers have themselves, like the witches of Germany or Scotland, disappeared in our day. The truth is that the negroes are less superstitious than of old, and having discarded the imaginary crime from their belief, have also discarded the real one by which it was supplemented from their practice—just as the erasure of heresy from the catalogue of sins was immediately followed by the extinction of heretic-burning faggots. The beneficent triumphs of Rationalism, so ably chronicled by Mr. Lecky, are not confined to Europe and the European races, and the process of the sun brings wider thoughts to other men than the dwellers of the moorland by Locksley Hall.

Sorcerers, indeed, have, it is said, though from what cause I cannot readily determine, been of all times rare articles among the negro colonists of Surinam. So, too, though the large majority of the Bush-negroes are yet pagans—as were their ancestors before them, when, cutlass in hand, they hewed out their way to freedom—Obeah, so notoriously widespread throughout Africa, and, if report say true, not unknown to some West-Indian regions, is scarcely ever heard of

among them. Yet, did it exist in any notable degree, it could hardly have failed, by the natural contagion of evil, to have established itself also among the Creole blacks, their immediate neighbours and kinsmen, who are, however, in general remarkably free from any imputation of the kind. Nor, again, are the Bush-negroes—nowadays at least—addicted to the indiscriminate fetish worship so often described by modern travellers as prevalent in Africa. Perhaps they may have been so formerly. At present the “ceiba” or “cotton-tree,” that noblest forest-growth of the West Indies, enjoys almost alone, if report says true, the honours of negro worship, avowedly among the Maroons, furtively in the Creole villages. I myself have often seen the traces of offerings—fowls, yams, libations of drink, and the like—scattered round its stem; the spirit-dweller of its branches, thus propitiated, is said to be of an amiable disposition; unlike its demon-brother of the poison-tree, or Hiari, also venerated by some, but out of fear. Idols in the strict sense of the term they certainly have none; and their rejection of Roman Catholicism, a circumstance to which I have alluded before, is asserted to have had at least for its ostensible motive their dislike of the image-worship embodied in that system.

I would willingly indulge the charitable hope that the Moravian Bush-negro converts may possibly have acquired some kind of idea of the virtue commonly designated, though in a restricted use of the word, by the name of morality. It is a virtue with which their Pagan brethren are, in a general way, lamentably unacquainted. On principle, if the phrase may be allowed, they are polygamists; but the frequency of divorce renders, it is said, the dignity of a Bush-negro's wife more often successional than simultaneous. Indeed their avowed laxity in this and analogous directions is sometimes asserted, but how truly I cannot say, to be one of the chief hindrances to the increase of their numbers. Without going into the particulars of an obscure and unpleasant subject, thus much is clear, that a child which has for its parents “no father and not much of a mother,” a normal condition of things in the Bush-negro villages, must necessarily commence the infantile struggle for life under somewhat disadvantageous conditions. To this may be added a total absence of medical practitioners; a circumstance which however might, by a cynical mind, be rather reckoned among the counter-balancing advantages of forest existence.

In form and stature the Bush-negroes of Surinam may rank among the best specimens of the Ethiopian type; the men are often six feet and more in height, with well-developed limbs and pleasing open countenances; and the women in every physical respect are, to say the least, worthy of their mates. Ill-modelled trunks and disproportioned limbs are, in fact, as rare among them as they are

common among some lighter-complexioned races. Their colour is in general very dark, and gives no token of the gradual tendency to assume a fairer tint that may be observed among the descendants of negroes resident in more northerly latitudes ; their hair, too, is as curly as that of any Niam-niam or Darfoozee chief, or native of Senegal. I have heard it asserted more often than once, that by long domicilement in the South American continent, the negro type has a tendency to mould itself into one approaching that of the Indian aboriginal ; and something of the kind might be looked for, if anywhere, among the Bush-negroes of the Surinam interior. But in the specimens that I saw, and they were many, I could not detect any such modification.

Their language is a curious and uncouth mixture. When it is analysed, English appears to form its basis ; next on the list of contributors comes Portuguese, then Dutch, besides a sprinkling of genuine African words thrown in at random ; and the thick soft African pronunciation over all. But of this jargon the negroes themselves make no use in writing, for which they employ Dutch, thereby showing themselves in this respect possessed of a truer feeling of the fitness of things than, I regret to say, their Moravian friends, who have taken superfluous pains to translate books of instruction and devotion into the so-called " negro language " for the supposed benefit of their half-tamed scholars—an instance, one amongst many, of being too practical by half.

Fortunately for the Bush-negroes themselves, their ultimate tendency in language, as in everything else, is to uniformity with the general Creole colonial type ; one not of the very highest, it may be, but much superior to the half or three-quarters savagery in which they at present live. Their little, and, so to speak, accidental nationality, is composed of elements too feeble, and too loosely put together, not to be ultimately reabsorbed into the more vigorous and better constructed mass to which, though under differing conditions, it once belonged. Old mistrusts and antipathies are fast wearing themselves out in the daily contact with European life ; and contact with Europeans never fails to produce, where negroes are concerned, first imitation, then assimilation. So long as slavery lasted, this was of course an impossibility for the Bush-negroes ; it is now a mere question of time, longer or shorter according to the discretion and tact of the Colonial Government itself. And we may reasonably hope that the sagacity and moderation by which that same Government has thus far always distinguished itself will not fail it in this matter either.

Freedom from taxation and internal autonomy are the special privileges which the Bush-negroes in their present condition enjoy ; by the latter they set some store, by the former much. On the other

hand they are fully aware of the greater advantages and enjoyments of a more settled and civilised form of life than their own, and would sacrifice much to make it theirs. The result of the exchange would be undoubtedly a very beneficial one, not only to the Bush-negroes themselves but to the colony at large. Labour is the one great requisite of Surinam; rich in every gift of unassisted nature, she is poor of that which alone could enable her to make profit of these gifts. In these Maroon subjects of hers close at hand she possesses a copious and as yet an unemployed reserve force of labour, superior in most respects to the Coolie or Chinese article, and, which is a main point, cheaper by far. The complete incorporation into colonial life and work of the negro element, now comparatively isolated and wasted in the bush, would add about a third to the progressiveness and energy of Dutch Surinam.

CHAPTER VI.

MUNNICKENDAM.

“Not a word, a word, we stand upon our manners.
Come, strike up.” (*Music: here a dance.*)

SHAKESPEARE.

BUSH-NEGROES are fine fellows of their kind; I have seldom seen finer. Indians are, within certain limits, picturesque; Chinese, if not ornamental, are decidedly useful; and Coolies, though not unfrequently neither, are sometimes both. But, after all said, to be innocuous is the Indian's highest praise; and any notable increase in West-Indian lands of “Celestials” is—for reasons not all celestial, but much the reverse—not a thing to be desired; while Coolies are expensive to import, and, as settlers, offer but a dubious future. Negroes, with all their defects, are now, as of old times, West-Indian labour's best hope; and since “salt-water” blacks and purchased gangs are no longer to be had, Creole negroes must to the fore. In this view, if in no other, they are worth study, and where can we study them better than at Munnickendam?

And here I would like, though I am not going to do it, to insert a sketch of the little village—not so little, neither—near Bel-Air, on the way to Berbice, where live the liberated Congoites, or Congoese, or Congonians, rescued by our cruisers from the slave-ships to which they had already been consigned, and brought hither at a recent date. It is a village absolutely picturesque in its details; and what is, perhaps, more to the purpose, it offers to view in itself, and in its garden surroundings, abundant evidence of industry, skill, and the manly independence that lives by its own labour, and is content

to live so. Another sketch, too, I would willingly give—that of the new quarter of Paramaribo, the one, I mean, situated on the westernmost outskirts of the town, and called “The Plain of the 13th May.” That date last year was the jubilee of the Dutch king’s reign, and to celebrate the occasion the governor had offered prizes to the negro workmen who would best excel in laying out the roads and digging the trenches of the proposed suburb. It was opened on the day itself with great pomp and ceremony, and distribution of rewards, by his Excellency in person, and was at once made over to its present inhabitants, a class resembling in every respect the tenants of Bel-Air. A pretty patchwork of cottages and gardens, well-doing, diligent free-men to maintain them in order and comfort, a sight to justify the pride that its originator takes in it, a successful experiment, on a small scale, indeed, but arousing a wish for more.

And this is exactly what, not I only; but every landowner, every proprietor, every planter in the colony, would wish to see—namely, a greater abundance of villages and settlements like those just described, only to a wider purpose and on a larger scale. Certainly I have no desire to disparage the good qualities of the slave-descended black Creoles, or to join in the vague outcries, contradicted everywhere by facts, that ignorance, and still more prejudice, have raised against them. But this much must be allowed, that from the very circumstance of being slave-descended, they bear, and long will bear, traces of the deteriorating process to which they have been subjected in the persons of their ancestors, a deterioration not moral merely, but mental, and even physical. In fact, their rapid, though as yet only partial, recovery from this very degradation is one proof among many of the wonderful elasticity of the negro character. Hesiod, if I remember rightly, or, if not he, some other old coeval Greek, has said, “When Jupiter makes a man a slave he takes away half his brains from him;” and a truer thing was never said or sung. Cowardice, duplicity, dislike of labour, a habit of theft, sexual immorality, irreflectiveness, apathy—these are the seven daughters of slavery, and they but too often live persistently on, though their ill mother be dead for generations past. Hence the negro who has never been a slave, or who, at any rate, has never experienced that most crushing form of slavery, the organized task-mastership of a foreign and superior race, has a decided vantage ground, not only over his enslaved fellow-countrymen, but over the descendants of such, on whom his father’s sins, and still more the sins of his father’s masters, are by hereditary law visited even to the third and fourth generation.

Now assuming that of all races the negro is by physical constitution the best adapted to the South American tropics, and that negro labour is of all others, not the cheapest merely, but also the most

efficient in this soil—both of which are propositions that few experienced planters or overseers, will dispute—why not organize migration from Africa to the West Indies after a regular and durable fashion? and, as the East-African races are undoubtedly superior alike in mind and body to the Western, why not establish an emigration agency on the east coast—why not fix a locality at Zanzibar? Have we not lately closed in principle, and shall soon by means of our cruisers have closed in fact and deed, the East-African slave-trade, doing thereby a deed worthy of England, worthy of ourselves? True, and we look at our work and justly pronounce it to be “very good.” But what if some of the immediate results of our work, in order to be rightly called “very good,” also require careful management, and the dexterity that not only destroys what is bad, but replaces it by something better? Have we not, while forbidding the further outpourings of the poison-stream that has for ages flowed in tears and blood from the ports of the East-African coast, driven back in a manner the bitter waters to eddy on themselves; and while stopping a recognised outlet of the unemployed and superabundant population, a wasteful and a wrongful one it is true, yet an outlet, created a novel surplus in the inland African labour market, where violence and captivity are the only laws of exchange and supply? Have we not also, while depriving Zanzibar of its hateful but long-established trade, the trade that alone gave it importance and wealth, curtailed the revenues, and with the revenues the very kingship of one whose patrons we had before consented to be, and whom we had ourselves taught to shelter his authority, nay, his very existence, under our flag?

Now so it is that of both the evils I have indicated, and neither of them are imaginary, a remedy is within easy reach, a remedy not only efficacious with regard to its immediate object, but beneficial in its ulterior results. “Easy reach,” did I say? Yes, easy enough if only well-meaning ignorance will stand aside, and have the grace to permit what it cannot comprehend. But this is a piece of good fortune to be wished for rather than hoped, and already I seem to hear a horrified outcry of “negro kidnapping,” “disguised slavery,” “slave-trade re-established,” and the rest, rising from every platform, and re-echoed from every bench of the Anti-Slavery Association and its kindred supporters. What! supply the deficit of West-Indian labour by negro importation from the East Coast! give the Seyyid, Sultan, or Sultanlet of Zanzibar, perhaps him of Muscat too, a nominal patronage and a real percentage of an emigration agency! load ships with African semi-slaves! bear them “far from home and all its pleasures,” to the coasts of Surinam, of Demerara, of St. Vincent, &c. ! what is all this but to revive the

monster we have ourselves so lately slain, to stultify our own wisdom, annul our own decree ?

Nothing of the kind ; say rather it is to hinder the brood that the monster has left from coming into life, to confirm the decree of self-maintaining freedom ; to complete what else if left imperfect might speedily bring in question the wisdom of our former deeds. It is to transfer, not by compulsion, but by their own free consent, those who, if they remain at home, cannot by the nature of things be other than slaves or slave-makers, to the conditions of honourable labour, self-support, and security ; to bring them into the full possession of whatever benefits organized society and equitable law can confer ; to substitute, so far as their own former masters are concerned, a fair and beneficial for an unjust and cruel gain ; to bestow on the lands of their destination advantages that no other means, no other colonists can equally secure.

It is certain that, if conducted under regulations and safeguards similar to those provided for the Coolie emigrants of Bengal and Madras, and with the same or analogous provisions in matters of engagement, voyage, and occupation, the unnecessary and burdensome obligation of a return passage being alone omitted, East African emigration would be much less costly, and at the same time much more profitable to the colonies, than Indian or Chinese. The negro is of himself a better agricultural labourer than the Hindoo ; he is stronger, healthier, more readily domiciled, more easily ruled, and, an important point, more likely to devote himself to field and country work after the expiration of his indentures. He is also much less disposed than either Coolie or Chinaman to swell the town population and the criminal list. I have said that in his case the option of a return passage might be safely omitted, for no negro, the solitary hero of Mrs. Hemans' ballad excepted, has any great longing to revisit his own natal land ; his country is not where he was born, but where he is well off ; no local worship, no sacred rivers, no ties of caste, draw him back to his first home. In him, therefore, is the best if not the only hope of supplementing the great, the urgent want of the New World, an indigenous population—for the Guiana Indian must unfortunately reckon for nothing, either in number or in available worth—and thus the benefit derived from him as an indentured labourer would be followed by the still more lasting benefit of an acclimatized and a useful colonist. And, to return to our friends of the Anti-Slavery Association, the evidence collected on all hands may surely have convinced the members of that respectable body, that Coolie emigration and Coolie labour in the West Indies are further removed from hardship, injustice, and slavery, than are too often the means by which our own agricultural labour-market is supplied, or the conditions by

which it is governed. Let them then rest assured that the same system would have no worse result for the East-African negro also.

Enough of this. The subject is one that cannot fail to be taken up sooner or later, not in speculative view, but in experimental practice; till then let it rest. Perhaps the time is not come yet; the very extent of the prospect suggests its distance. But, a little sooner, a little later, not the less surely it will be reached. An African colony, the Arab, has already half peopled the East; an African law, matured in Egypt, promulgated on the shores of the Red Sea, remodelled and re-promulgated in the deserts of the same coast, rules over half Asia this day. Already the Lybian Sibyl prepares to turn the next page of her book; its writing is the West. A new creation is wanted here; and creation of this sort is a work not for the European or his half-cousin the Hindoo, it belongs to the elder races. The Aryan of our day, the Indo-German, can elaborate, can perfect, he cannot originate; art-trained, art-exhausted, the productive energy of nature is his no longer. Unmodified by science, unpruned by art, the rough off-shoots of the over-teeming African stem are vital with the rude vitality of nature; like her they are prolific too.

Is it a dream? Possibly so; a nature-sent dream, as under the hot sun we float in breezeless calm down the glassy black waters between high walls of reed and forest, bright flowers, broad leaf, and over-topping palm up to the intense heaven all a-glow, till here before us on the left river-bank rise the bower-like avenues of Munnickendam. Here let us land, and from the study of the long-settled Creole negroes of this secluded estate let us draw, if so disposed, some augury as to what their brethren of the East-African coast, the colonists of our visionary or visioned future, are likely to be in and for South-American Surinam.

This at any rate is no dream. Two hundred and seventeen acres, two hundred and sixty labourers, all without exception negro-creole; average yearly produce, seven hundred and fifty hogsheads of sugar, besides molasses and rum; so much for Munnickendam statistics. Machinery of the older and simple sort; factory buildings corresponding; planter's dwelling-house large, old, and three-storied, Dutch in style, with high roof, and fantastic wolves topping the gables by way of weathercocks; a wide double flight of steps in front with a paved space, surrounded by an open parapet before the hall door; the garden very Dutch in its walks, flower-beds, and statues; long avenues, some of palmiste, some of areka palm, some of almond trees, with sago palms intermixed; around a green turfy soil, and a crescent background of cane-fields and forest; so much and enough, I think, for general description. Negroes very sturdy, very black, very plainly dressed, or half-dressed, in white and blue;

the women rejoicing in variegated turbans; children *à la* Cupid and Psyche as to costume, though not perhaps in feature or shape; three or four white men, overseers, straw-hatted, of course; lastly, for visitors, the Governor and his party, myself included; such are the principal accessories of the picture. Time, from five or so in the afternoon to midnight, or thereabouts; we did not very accurately consult our watches.

Night had fallen; but no—this is a phrase well enough adapted, it may be, to the night of the North, the heavy murky veil slowly let down fold after fold over the pale light that has done duty for days—here it is not so; transparent in its starry clearness, its stainless atmosphere, night rises as day had risen before, a goddess succeeding a goddess; not to blot out the fair world, but to enchase it in a black diamond circle in place of a white; to change enchantment for enchantment, the magic of shadow for the magic of light. But I am anticipating. A good hour before sunset the covered barge of the estate had set us ashore on the wharf, where, with flowers in their hands, songs on their lips, smiles on every face, and welcome in every gesture, the boys and girls of the place received us from the “stelling.” Between this double human range, that like an inner and more variegated avenue lined the over-arching trees from the water’s edge up to the dwelling-house, we passed along, while the merry tumult of the assembled crowd, and the repeated discharge of the small cannon planted at the landing place and in the garden mingled together to announce and greet our arrival. The warm although almost level sunbeams lit up the red brick lines of the central mansion, the tall tower-like factory chimneys, the statues in the garden, the pretty bush-embosomed cottages of the estate, and tipped with yellow gold the plummy cane-fields beyond. This lasted some time, till the sun set, and for a little while all was orderly and still in the quiet evening light.

But soon night had risen, and with her had risen the white moon, near her full, and now the merry-makers who had dispersed to their evening meal re-assembled on the gravel walks and clean-kept open spaces of the garden in front of the dwelling-house, to enjoy the sport of the hour; for in the West Indies as in Africa, in Surinam no less than at Damascus, the night is the negro’s own time; and no member of Parliament in the latter months of the session, no fashionable beauty in her fourth London season, can more persistently invert the solar allotment of the hours than does the negro votary of pleasure; and wherever and however pleasure be attainable, the negro is its votary.

Group by group, distinctly seen in the pale moonlight as if by day, only with an indistincter background, our Creole friends flocked on. The preparations for the dance were soon made. Drums, fifes, a

shrill violin, and a musical instrument some say of Indian, some say of negro invention, consisting of a notched gourd that when scraped by a small stick gives out a sound not unlike the chirping of a monster cricket, and accentuates time and measure after the fashion of triangles, were brought from Heaven knows what repositories, and with them the tuneful orchestra was complete. The dancers ranged themselves; more than a hundred men and women, mostly young, all dressed in their choicest for the night's sport. The men, with few exceptions, were attired in white trowsers and shirts of various colours, with a predominance of red; some dandies had wrapped gay sashes round their waists, and most had provided themselves with sprigs of flowers, jauntily stuck in their hatbands. The women's dresses consisted chiefly of loose white sacques, without the cumbrous under-layer of petticoats, or the other "troublesome disguises" that Europe conceals her beauties withal, and reserved their assortment of bright but rarely inharmonious colours for their fantastic turbans, some of which were arranged so as to give the effect of one or two moderate-sized horns projecting from the wearer's head, while other girls, with better taste, left an embroidered end hanging down on one side, Eastern fashion. Many of the women were handsome, shapely figures, full-limbed and full-bosomed; but—must I say it?—the particular charm of delicate feet and hands was universally wanting; nor indeed could it have been fairly looked for among a throng of field-labourers, female or male. As to faces, the peculiarities of the negro countenance are well known in caricature; but a truer pattern may be seen, by those who wish to study it, any day among the statues of the Egyptian rooms in the British Museum: the large gentle eye, the full but not over-protruding lips, the rounded contour, and the good-natured, easy, consensual expression. This is the genuine African model; one not often, I am aware, to be met with in European or American thoroughfares, where the plastic African too readily acquires the careful look and even the irregularity of the features that surround him, but which is common enough in the villages and fields where he dwells after his own fashion, among his people, most common of all in the tranquil seclusion and congenial climate of a Surinam plantation. There you may find also a type neither Asiatic nor European, but distinctly African, with much of independence and vigour in the male physiognomy, and something that approaches, if it does not quite reach, beauty in the female. Rameses and his queen were cast in no other mould.¹

The Governor and ourselves were seated with becoming dignity on

(1) I am glad that so keen and so discriminating an observer as the late Mr. Winwood Reade concurs with this very opinion; in support of which he cites the authority of Livingstone himself.—*Vide* "African Sketch-Book," vol. 1. p. 106.

the wide open balcony atop of the steps leading up to the hall door, thus commanding a full view of the garden and the people assembled. Immediately in front of us was a large flower-bed, or rather a labyrinth of flower-beds, among which stood, like white goblins in the moonlight, the quaint statues before mentioned, methodically arranged after the most approved Dutch style, and flanked by two pieces of mimic artillery. Such was the centre-piece, and on either side there opened out a wide clear space, clean swept and strewn with "caddy," the usual white mixture of broken shell, coral, and sand, and in each of these spaces to right and left a band of musicians, or rather noise-makers, squatted negro-wise on the ground. Round these centres of attraction the crowd soon gathered in a double group, men and women, all noisy, animated, and ready for the dance. The moon, almost at the full, glittered bright overhead, and her uncertain light, while giving full effect to the half-barbaric picturesqueness of attire and form, in the shifting eddy of white-clad figures, served also to veil from too exact view the defects—and they were many—in the clothes, ornaments, and appearance of the performers. Around the garden, and behind it, dark masses of palm, almond-tree, acacia, "saman," and kindred growths, rose against the sky, loftier and denser in seeming than by day. The whole formed an oval picture of brightness and life amid a dark and silent framework of shadow, a scene part gay, part impressive, and very tropical above all.

The music, or what did duty for such, began. At first it was of a European character, or rather travestied from European—disintegrated quadrilles and waltzes to no particular time. The negroes around, shy as they always are when in the presence of those whose criticisms they fear (for no race is more keenly sensitive in regard to ridicule than the African, except it be, perhaps, the semi-African Arab), did not at once venture to put forth all their prowess, and the performance opened with a few sporadic couples, women dancing with women, men poussetting to men, and either seeming half ashamed of their own audacity. But as the music continued and grew livelier, passing more and more from the imitation-European to the unfeigned African style of an unbroken monotonous drone with one ever-recurring cadence, a mere continuity of clanging sound, the dancers grew more animated. New couples, in which the proper interchange of sex was observed by the partners, formed themselves, till at last the larger group—that on our left—took up the genuine Ethiopian dance, well known in Oman, and witnessed by me there and elsewhere in the pleasant days, now long since gathered to the ineffectual past, when the East and I were one. A dance of life, where men ranged on one side and women on the other, advance, retreat, cross, join hands, break into whirling knots of twos and fours, separate, reform in line, to blend again into a seeming maze of orderly confusion—a whirl of very madness, yet with method in it—the intoxication of movement and

sound poured out in time and measure. He who has witnessed it, if there yet flow within his veins one drop of that primal savage blood without which manhood and womanhood too are not much better than mere titular names, cannot but yield himself up to the influence of the hour, cannot but drink of the bowl, join in the revel; and if any looker-on retains coolness enough to sneer or blame, why, let each follow his bent; but I for one had rather be on the side of David than of Michal, and the former had in the end, I think, the best of the jest and of the earnest too.

A Bacchanalian orgie, yet one in which Bacchus himself had no share; Venus alone presided, and sufficient for all beside; or, if Bacchus seemed present to her aid, it was not he, but Cupid in disguise. Half an hour, an hour the revelry continued, while the tumult grew every minute louder, and the dance more vehement, till, with an impulse simultaneous in its suddenness, the double chorus broke up, and blending in one confused mass, surrounded his Excellency the Governor, while, amid shouts, laughter, and huzzas, half a dozen sturdy blacks caught him up in their arms and bore him aloft in triumphal procession three times round the garden, while others gesticulated and pressed alongside, others danced before, all cheered, and we ourselves, aroused from our Africano-Oriental dream by the local significance of the act, hardly knew whether to laugh or to yield to the enthusiasm of the moment. That the Governor, though maintaining as far as possible an appearance of passive dignity and deprecatory acquiescence, heartily enjoyed the spontaneous tribute of affection and loyalty thus tumultuously expressed, I have no doubt, and so would you have enjoyed it, my dear reader, had it been offered you. Besides, he told me as much when, after a tremendous outburst of huzzas, his living throne gently dissolved asunder and allowed him footing on the ground again.

Then after a half-hour's pause, congratulations exchanged, healths drunk, and cordial merriment, in which all shared alike—performers, spectators, Europeans, negroes, and the rest—once more to the dance, but now in calmer measure and to a gentler tune. By this the moon, small and dazzling, rode high in the purple heavens, giving warning of midnight near, when, escorted down to the water's edge by those whose sports we had witnessed, and perhaps in part shared, we reluctantly threaded the dark shades of the avenue river-wards, and re-embarked on our little steamer, that had yet to bear us a mile farther along the current before we reached the night's lodging and rest prepared for us by the district magistrate, in his large and comfortable residence at Ephrata, so the place was named.

"I wished you to see something of our black Creoles as they are among themselves," said the Governor, as next morning we pursued our downward way to the river junction at the Sommelsdyk Fort, and thence turned off southward to explore the upper branch of the

Commeweyne, which we had on our way up passed by unvisited. Deep black, and much more rapid than the Cottica, its current flowed between noble forest scenes, alternating with cultivated spaces on either bank; but few large sugar estates came in view; plantains, cocoanuts, cassava, with cocoa-bushes intermixed, seemed the more favourite growths. . The yearly amount of sugar manufactured in this district does not exceed one thousand hogsheads; the mills are all of the simplest kind, and moved by water-power. In general character, the scenery and water-side objects of the upper Commeweyne nearly resemble those of the upper Cottica, and have been sufficiently described before; a gradual diminution of underwood, an increase of height and girth in the forest trees, and a greater variety in them and in the flowering creepers that interlaced their boughs, being for many miles up country almost the only distinct indications of approach to the higher lands beyond, though the practised eye of a naturalist might doubtless detect many significant varieties in the insects or plants of the region.

And now, as we slowly stem the liquid glass, black as jet yet pure as crystal, of the strong-flowing Commeweyne, we remark (the Governor and I) the evident and recent increase in the number of small plantations, to the detriment—though a temporary one only, if events run their regular course—of the larger properties. This is a necessary phase of free labour, and through it the Surinam colony, like every other of like kind, must pass before it can reach the firm ground of self-sustaining prosperity. Till then, nothing is solid, nothing sure. Giant sugar estates—propped up or absolutely maintained by extraneous capital, and excluding or dwarfing into comparative nullity the varied parcel cultivation of local ownership and resources, are at best magnificent gambling speculations, most so when the price of their produce is not stored up, but at once applied to widening the enclosures, or purchasing some costly refinements of improved machinery. Establishments like these are every instant at the mercy of a sudden fluctuation of the market, of a new invention, of a tariff—in a word, they lie exposed to every accident of Fortune's caprice; and, capricious as she is throughout her whole domain, nowhere is the goddess more so than in the commercial province. Hence it follows that they who repine at the lengthening catalogue of five-acre and ten-acre lots—railing at their cultivators as idle pumpkin-eating squatters, and raising a desponding moan, occasionally an indignant howl, over the consequent withdrawal of labour from the five-hundred or thousand-acre estates—are not more reasonable in their complaints than he who should fall foul of the workmen employed in digging and laying the foundations of the house, and declare them to be lazy loons, and their labour valueless, because they do not at once bestow it on raising the second storey and furnishing the drawing-room.

In Dutch Guiana, taking Paramaribo, the capital, for its centre, we may regard the rest of the territory as made up, after a rough fashion, of three concentric circles. The circumference of the innermost one would, for what concerns the east and the districts we have now been visiting, pass through the confluence-point of the Commeweyne and Cottica Rivers at Sommelsdyk Fort; the second would intersect through the estate of La Paix on the upper Cottica, and the corresponding estate of Abendsrust on the upper Commeweyne; the external limits of the third would be correlative with those of the colonial frontier itself. Within the first circle, large estates, mostly owned by Europeans, or at any rate European Creoles, predominate. Throughout the second or intermediate circle, smaller properties, mostly in the hands of coloured or black Creoles, are more common. In the outermost space are the villages and provision grounds, few and far between, of the Bush-nègroes, between whom and the European landholders the dark Creoles thus form a sort of link, social as well as territorial; or, to vary the phrase, a connecting medium, destined, if our conjectures be true, to become ultimately an absorbing one, not only of the more savage but of the more civilised element also.

But we are forgetting His Excellency. "In the labourers of Munnickendam," he continued, "you have a fair sample of our black Creoles; throughout the colony they are everywhere essentially the same. Fond enough, as you have seen, of pleasure and amusement, when they can get them; but when at work steady, sober, willing, and, what is a fortunate thing for all parties, without a trace of social or political restlessness in any direction. Their only fault is that there is not enough of them, and, what is worse, their numbers do not increase."

Why not? Unhealthy climate, some will say; while others, in concert with a late author, talk in bated breath of gross and ruinous vices, rendering it a question whether negroes should exist on the earth at all for a few generations longer; and others again find in infanticide a third and convenient solution of the question. Let us look a little closer.

And first, for the climate. Like British Guiana, its Dutch namesake is a low-lying plain, swampy in some places, forest-grown in others, and far within the tropics; none of them at first sight favourable conditions to salubrity of atmosphere. But where fresh sea-winds sweep over the earth day and night with scarce interrupted steadiness from year's end to year's end, an open plain is healthier by far than the sheltered valleys and picturesque nooks of a mountainous district; and among tidal streams on a tidal coast, the marsh-fevers, that render the moist shores of the stagnant Black Sea pool scarce less pestilential than those of Lagos itself, find little place. Tropical heat, though here it is never excessive, does not certainly in the long

run suit European residents; and at Surinam, where 79 F. is the yearly average—the highest ever recorded being 96 F. and the lowest 70—the climate must be admitted to be a warm one. On the other hand, those who have experience of Africa, the negro's birthplace, or have seen how much the black suffers in the comparatively moderate chill of winter-season in the northern West-Indian Islands, will hardly consider the heat of Dutch Guiana to be too great for the species that forms a good four-fifths of its population.

As to the second-named cause, or collection of causes rather, it is to be regretted that the author of "At Last" should, from ignorance, doubtless, or prejudice; have ever left such vague and baseless calumnies the sanction of his respected name. Without being either a "clergyman," or even, though an official, a "police magistrate," I have knowledge enough of negro characters and ways to warrant me in asserting, and my readers in believing the assertion, that what is technically called vice is among Africans nearer allied to philoprogenitiveness than among, it may well be, most other races; and without attempting to excuse, much less, as some seem inclined to do, to vindicate the extreme laxity of their theory and practice in regard of connubial fidelity or maiden virtue, one must allow that their faults in these respects tend much more directly to the increase of the population than to its diminution. And, to have done once for all with a topic the mention of which, though unavoidable, is unpleasing, it may here be added that excess in alcoholic drink—a fault decidedly opposed, as all who have studied the subject know, to the "increase and multiply" of healthy Nature—is rare among the black Creoles of the Surinam capital, and rarer still, indeed almost unknown, among those of the country. So much for the second cause assigned.

A mere inspection of the yearly birth-rate, averaging thirty per thousand, disposes of the third allegation. Murdered children are not entered on parochial registers, nor do the numbers given leave much margin for kindred crimes at an earlier stage.

And yet the annual death-rate exceeds that of births by at least one per cent., as is stated, and this at the best of times. Some years show two per cent., or even higher. How is this? and if neither climate, nor vice, nor crime be the cause, where is it then to be sought?

But here let some indulgence be asked and given. We are on board a pleasure-boat, and our attention is being called away every moment, now to gaze on a "tall tree by the side of the river, one half of which was in flames," or rather flowers red as flames, and not less bright, "from the root to the top, and the other half green and in full leaf," that might have reminded Geraint and Enid of their Celtic wonderland; now to acknowledge the shouted welcome of bright figures crowding to some little landing-place on the way; now

by an opening vista of glittering plantain groves ; now by a tray full of glasses with appropriate contents circulating at frequent intervals round the deck. Amid interruptions like these it must be admitted that profound investigations, statistical columns, and a marshalled array of figures and facts, would be hardly less out of place than a sermon at a masked ball. But it is possible to say truth, and even serious truth, without sermonizing ; *videntem dicere vera* and the rest. We will try.

All have heard, and all who have not merely heard but seen will attest, the fondness of negroes for children ; nor their own children only, but any, white, brown, or black—for children generically taken, in a word. Demonstrative as is their affection, it is none the less genuine ; the feeling is instinctive, and the instinct itself is hardly ever absent from among them. I do not put it forward as a matter of praise, I mention it as a fact. If Sir S. Baker's sweeping assertion regarding I forget how many negro tribes, that they have among them no acknowledged form of worship of the Unknown, were exact, which it is not, the existence, the universality indeed, of baby-worship at any rate must be allowed, I think, even by that distinguished miso-African. Nor is this species of worship limited to the mothers of the babies, or to the womankind at large ; it is practised in the same degree by the men, who are not a whit behind the women in their love and care of children, especially the youngest.

But in the very fervour and ecstasy of her baby-worship, the negress-mother persists in worshipping her little divinity irreflectively, recklessly, and by a natural consequence often injuriously, sometimes destructively, to the baby-god itself. Heated from field-work, excited, over-done, she returns in the late afternoon to her cottage, and the first thing she does when arrived there is to catch up her little brown sprawler from the floor and put it to her breast. The result needs no guessing. Half an hour later she is howling as only a negress can howl over her offspring, convulsed or dead. Or perhaps, just as she was about to give, in more orderly fashion, the nourishment that the infant has been faintly waiting for some time past, a friend comes in to invite her to a dance or merry-making close by. Off she goes, having made Heaven knows what arrangements for the small creature's wants, or it may well be, in her eagerness for amusement, no arrangement at all ; purposes to come back in an hour, stays away until midnight, and, on her return home, finds another midnight, the midnight that knows no sunrise, closed over her child. And thus, and more. On over-feeding, injudicious feeding ; ailments misunderstood ; quack-doctoring—always preferred by the ignorant to all other ; on half-superstitious usages, not less injurious than silly ; on violent outbursts of passion—the passions of a negress, and

of a negro too, are at tropical heat, their rage absolute phrenzy—I need not dwell;—suppose what you will, you will be short of the mark. But cease to wonder if, among the most kindly-hearted, child-loving, and, I may add, child-producing race in the world, births, however numerous, are less in computation than deaths, if one-third, at least, by statistical registration—one full half, if to its records be added unregistered fact—of the negro children in Dutch Guiana die even before they are weaned. The causes, ninety-nine out of a hundred, are those which I have stated or alluded to, and no other.

What is, then, to be done? An evil, or rather an agglomeration of evils like these, that threaten to cut down the main-stem of the future, to dry up the very roots, to destroy the existence of the colony, must be put an end to, all will agree; but how?

There is a remedy, and a very simple one, tried before, and worth trying again. Let us go back in memory to the times when every individual negro life meant so many hundred florins to his owner, when the suppression of the “trade” had cut off the supply from without, and the birth of every slave-child on the estate brought a clear gain to the planter, just as its death represented an actual and heavy loss hard to replace, not to the parents only, but to the owner of parents and children too. Negroes and negresses might be never so unthinking then, never so reckless about what concerned themselves alone, but their master took good thought that they should not be careless where his own interest was involved. And in few things was it so closely involved, especially after the treaties of 1815 and 1819, as in the preservation of infant life among the labouring stock, and no precaution was neglected that could ensure this, and supplement the defects of maternal care. Many means were adopted; but the chiefest of all was the appointment on every estate of one or more of elderly women, appropriately styled “mamas,” chosen from among the negresses themselves, and whose sole duty was to watch each over a given number of infantile negroes, for whose proper care, nourishment, and good condition generally this foster-mother had to answer, and for whose loss, if they drooped and died, she was called to strict account. The history of slave institutions has been not inappropriately called the “devil’s book;” but here, at any rate, is a leaf of it worth taking out for insertion in a better volume.

Now fill up this outline project with the proper colouring of qualifications, provisos, regulations, and the remaining supplemental details of theory wrought out into fact, and you will have a scheme for the preservation of infant negro life, or rather the hindrance of its prodigal and ruinous waste, more likely to succeed in its object than any that I have yet heard or seen in practice. Then combine these, or similar measures, with a reasonable supply of the two needful things, without which neither Surinam nor any other Trans-

atlantic colony can prosper, or, indeed, exist—capital and immigration. Not the capital of official subsidy, but of private enterprise; nor the immigration of costly and burdensome East-Indian Coolies, or the yet costlier and yet more troublesome Chinese, but of vigorous, healthy, willing East Africans, the ex-slaves of the Zanzibar and Oman markets. Then put these three requisites together, and stand up and prophesy to Dutch Guiana what golden-aged future you will; nor fear being numbered, in the latter days, among the false prophets—your place will be with the true.

The sea-ebb has set the dammed-up waters of the Commeweyne at liberty to follow their natural bent, and we float swiftly down the stream, admiring, commenting, and enjoying, now the ever-varying, ever-recurring scenes of life and labour of tropical nature and European energy, of forest, plantation, mansion, cottage, and field that every river bend unfolds; now the “feast of reason and the flow of soul”—a very hackneyed phrase—as we go; and now more substantial feastings, and the flow of various compositions, very congenial to the Dutch soul and body too, nor less to the English. But the distance was considerable, and night looked down on us with its thousand starry eyes long before we reached Fort Amsterdam and the broad Surinam waters. An hour later we disembarked at the Government stelling of the silent capital, well pleased with our river-excursion and with each other.

Not many days after I was riding out with the Governor on the high-road—that is to say, on the horse-path, for the true high-road here, as elsewhere in Guiana, is by water—leading towards the wooded regions of Para, south-west of Paramaribo, to which, in composition with some other Indian word, it has given its name. Its inhabitants are reckoned, exclusive of Bush-negroes, at nearly five thousand; they live in villages, and occupy themselves to some extent in sugar cultivation, but generally in small lots, where grow cocoa, coffee, and plantains; indigo and tobacco are also among the products of the land. The ground is well raised above the water-level—to the south, indeed, it becomes hilly; the forest scenery is said to surpass in beauty, as in extent, that of any other district in the colony. “You can ride for seven days in one direction without ever getting out of the shade,” said the Governor, as I noticed the noble outskirts of the woods before us; and he urged on me, almost as a duty, a visit to Para, where, amid the small Creole proprietors and the forest-embowered villages, he assured me I should see Surinam negro life to better advantage, witness greater comfort and contentment, act spectator, or sharer, if the fancy took, of gayer festivities than even on the banks of the Cottica and at Munnicken-dam. But my hank of Surinam thread was too nearly spun out already, and the colours of other lands were now about to take its place in the fate-woven twine.

W. G. PALGRAVE.

ON SPELLING.

THE remarks which I venture to offer in these pages on the corrupt state of the present spelling of English, and on the advantages and disadvantages connected with a reform of English orthography, were written in fulfilment of a promise of very long standing. Ever since the publication of the Second Volume of my Lectures on the Science of Language in 1863, where I had expressed my sincere admiration for the courage and perseverance with which Mr. Isaac Pitman and some of his friends, particularly Mr. A. J. Ellis, for six years his most active associate, had fought the battle of a reform in English spelling, Mr. Pitman had been requesting me to state more explicitly than I had done in my Lectures my general approval of his lifelong endeavours. He wished more particularly that I should explain why I, though by profession an etymologist, was not frightened by the spectre of phonetic spelling, while such high authorities as Archbishop Trench and Dean Alford had declared that phonetic spelling would necessarily destroy the historical and etymological character of the English language.

If I ask myself why I put off the fulfilment of my promise from year to year, the principal reason I find is, that really I had nothing more to say than what, though in few words, I had said before. Everything that can be said on this subject has been said and well said, not only by Mr. Pitman, but by a host of writers and lecturers, among whom I might mention Mr. Alexander J. Ellis, Dr. Latham, Professors Haldeman, Whitney, and Hadley, Mr. Withers, Mr. E. Jones, Dr. J. H. Gladstone, and many others. The whole matter is no longer a matter for argument; and the older I grow, the more I feel convinced that nothing vexes people so much, and hardens them in their unbelief and in their dogged resistance to reforms, as undeniable facts and unanswerable arguments. Reforms are carried by Time, and what generally prevails in the end, are not logical deductions, but some haphazard and frequently irrational motives. I do not say, therefore, with Dean Swift, that "there is a degree of corruption wherein some nations, as bad as the world is, will proceed to an amendment; till which time particular men should be quiet." On the contrary, I feel convinced that practical reformers, like Mr. Pitman, should never slumber nor sleep. They should keep their grievances before the public in season and out of season. They should have their lamps burning, to be ready whenever the right time comes. They should repeat the same thing over and over again, undismayed by indifference, ridicule, contempt, and all the other weapons which the lazy world knows so well how to employ against those who venture to disturb its peace. I myself, however, am not a practical reformer; least of all in a matter which concerns Englishmen only—viz., the spelling of the English language. I

should much rather, therefore, have left the fight to others, content with being merely a looker on. But when I was on the point of leaving England my conscience smote me. Though, I had not actually given a pledge, I remembered how again and again I had said to Mr. Pitman that I would much rather keep than make a promise; and though overwhelmed with other work at the time, I felt that before my departure I ought, if possible, to satisfy Mr. Pitman's demands. The article was written; and though my own plans have since been changed, and I remain at Oxford, it may as well be published in discharge of a debt which has been for some time heavy on my conscience.

What I wish most strongly to impress on my readers is that I do not write as an advocate. I am not an agitator for phonetic reform in England. My interest in the matter is, and always has been, purely theoretical and scientific. Spelling and the reform of spelling are problems which concern every student of the science of language. It does not matter whether the language be English, German, or Dutch. In every written language the problem of reforming its antiquated spelling must sooner or later arise; and we must form some clear notion whether anything can be done to remove or alleviate a complaint inherent in the very life of language. If my friends tell me that the idea of a reform of spelling is entirely Quixotic, that it is a mere waste of time to try to influence a whole nation to surrender its historical orthography and to write phonetically, I bow to their superior wisdom as men of the world. But as I am not a man of the world, but rather an observer of the world, my interest in the subject, my convictions as to what is right and wrong, remain just the same. It is the duty of scholars and philosophers not to shrink from holding and expressing what men of the world call Quixotic opinions; for, if I read the history of the world rightly, the victory of reason over unreason, and the whole progress of our race, have generally been achieved by such fools as ourselves—"rushing in where angels fear to tread," till after a time the track becomes beaten, and even angels are no longer afraid. I hold, and have confessed much more Quixotic theories on language than this belief, that what has been done before by Spaniards and Dutchmen—what is at this very moment being done by Germans, viz., to reform their corrupt spelling—may be achieved even by Englishmen and Americans.

I have expressed my belief that the time will come when not only the various alphabets and systems of spelling, but many of the languages themselves which are now spoken in Europe, to say nothing of the rest of the world, will have to be improved away from the face of the earth and abolished. Knowing that nothing rouses the ire of a Welshman or a Gael so much as to assert the expediency, nay, necessity, of suppressing the teaching of their languages at school, it seems madness to hint that it would be a blessing to every child born in Holland, in Portugal, or in Denmark—nay, in Sweden and even

in Russia—if, instead of learning a language which is for life a barrier between them and the rest of mankind, they were at once to learn one of the great historical languages which confer intellectual and social fellowship with the whole world. If, as a first step in the right direction, four languages only, viz., English, French, German, Italian (or, possibly, Spanish), were taught at school, the saving of time—and what is more precious than time?—would be infinitely greater than what has been effected by railways and telegraphs. But I know that no name in any of the doomed languages would be too strong to stigmatise such folly. We should be told that a Japanese only could conceive such an idea; that for a people deliberately to give up its language was a thing never heard of before; that a nation would cease to be a nation if it changed its language; that it would, in fact, commit “the happy dispatch,” *à la Japonaise*. All this may be true, but I still hold that language is meant as an instrument of communication, and that, in the struggle for life, the most efficient instrument of communication must certainly carry the day, as long as natural selection, or, as we formerly called it, reason, rules the world.

To return, however, to the problem, to the solution of which Mr. Pitman has devoted the whole of his active life, let me say again that my interest in it is purely philological; or, if you like, historical. The problem which has to be solved in England is not a new one, nor an isolated one. It occurs again and again in the history of every language; in fact, it must occur. When languages are reduced to writing, they are at first written phonetically, though always in a very rough and ready manner. One dialect, that of the dominant, the literary or priestly, class, is generally selected; and the spelling, once adopted, becomes in a very short time traditional and authoritative. What took place thousands of years ago, we can see taking place, if we like, at the present moment. A missionary in the island of Mangaia, the Rev. W. Gill, first introduced the art of writing among his converts. He learnt their language, at least one dialect of it, he translated part of the Bible into it, and adopted, of necessity, a phonetic spelling. That dialect is gradually becoming the recognised literary language of the whole island, and his spelling is taught at school. Other dialects, however, continue to be spoken, and they may in time influence the literary dialect. For the present, however, the missionary dialect, as it is called by the natives themselves, and the missionary spelling, rule supreme, and it will be some time before a spelling reform is wanted out there.

Among the more ancient nations of Europe, not only does the pronunciation of a language maintain its inherent dialectic variety, and fluctuate through the prevalence of provincial speakers, but the whole body of a language changes, while yet the spelling, once adopted in public documents, and taught to children, remains for a long time the same. In early times, when literature was in its infancy, when copies of books could easily be counted, and when the

norma scribendi was in the hands of a few persons, the difficulty of adapting the writing to the ever varying pronunciation of a language was comparatively small. We see it when we compare the Latin of early Roman inscriptions with the Latin of Cicero. We know from Cicero himself that when he settled among the patricians of Rome, he had on some small points to change both his pronunciation and his spelling of Latin. The reform of spelling was a favourite subject with Roman scholars, and even emperors were not too proud to dabble in inventing new letters and diacritical signs. The difficulty, however, never assumed serious proportions. The small minority of people who were able to read and write pleased themselves as best they could, and, by timely concessions, prevented a complete estrangement between the written and the spoken language.

Then came the time when Latin ceased to be Latin, and the vulgar dialects, such as Italian, French, and Spanish, took its place. At that time the spelling was again phonetic, though here and there tinged by reminiscences of Latin spelling. There was much variety, but considering how limited the literary intercourse must have been between different parts of France, Spain, or Italy, it is surprising that on the whole there should have been so much uniformity in the spelling of these modern dialects. A certain local and individual freedom of spelling, however, was retained; and we can easily detect in mediæval MSS. the spelling of literate and illiterate writers, the hand of the learned cleric, the professional clerk, and the layman.

The great event which forms a decisive epoch in the history of spelling is the introduction of printing. With printed books, and particularly with printed bibles, scattered over the country, the spelling of words became rigid and universally binding. Some languages, such as Italian, were more fortunate than others in having a more rational system of spelling to start with. Some, again, like German, were able to make timely concessions, while others, such as Spanish, Dutch, and French, had Academies to help them at critical periods of their history. The most unfortunate in all these respects was English. It started with a Latin alphabet, the pronunciation of which was unsettled, and which had to be applied to a Teutonic language. After this first phonetic compromise it had to pass through a confused system of spelling, half Saxon, half Norman; half phonetic, half traditional. The history of the spelling, and even of the pronunciation, of English, in its passage from Anglo-Saxon to middle and modern English, has lately been studied with great success by Mr. Ellis and Mr. Sweet. I must refer to their books, "*On Early English Pronunciation*," and "*On the History of English Sounds*," which contain a wealth of illustration almost bewildering. And even after English reaches the period of printing, the confusion is by no means terminated; on the contrary, for a time it is greater than ever.¹ How this came to pass has been

(1) The pronoun *it* was spelt in eight different ways by Tyndale, thus, *hyt*, *hytt*, *hit*,
VOL. XIX. N.S. P P

well illustrated by Mr. Marsh in his excellent "Lectures on the English Language," p. 687, *seq.* What we now call the established system of English orthography may, in the main, be traced back to Johnson's Dictionary, and to the still more capricious sway exercised by large printing-offices and publishers. It is true that the evil of printing carried to a certain extent its own remedy. If the spelling became unchangeable, the language itself, too, was, by means of a printed literature, checked considerably in its natural growth and its dialectic variety. Nevertheless English has changed since the invention of printing; English is changing, though by imperceptible degrees, even now; and if we compare English as spoken with English as written, they seem almost like two different languages; as different as Latin is from Italian.

This, no doubt, is a national misfortune, but it is inevitable. Little as we perceive it, language is, and always must be, in a state of fermentation; and whether within hundreds or within thousands of years, all living languages must be prepared to encounter the difficulty which in England stares us in the face at present. "What shall we do?" ask our friends. There is our whole national literature, they say; our libraries actually bursting with books and newspapers. Are all these to be thrown away? Are all valuable books to be reprinted? Are we ourselves to unlearn what we have learnt with so much trouble, and what we have taught to our children with greater trouble still? Are we to sacrifice all that is historical in our language, and sink down to the low level of the *Phonetic Nuz*? I could go on multiplying these questions till even those men of the world who now have only a shrug of the shoulder for the reformers of spelling, should say, "We had no idea how strong our position really is."

But with all that, the problem remains unsolved. What are people to do when language and pronunciation change, while their spelling is declared to be unchangeable? It is, I believe, hardly necessary that I should prove how corrupt, effete, and utterly irrational the present system of spelling is, for no one seems inclined to deny all that. I shall only quote, therefore, the judgment of one man, the late Bishop Thirlwall, a man who never used exaggerated language. "I look," he says, "upon the established system, if an accidental custom may be so called, as a mass of anomalies, the growth of ignorance and chance, equally repugnant to good taste and to common sense. But I am aware that the public cling to these anomalies with a tenacity proportioned to their absurdity, and are jealous of all encroachment on ground consecrated by prescription to the free play of blind caprice."

hit, it, itt, yt, ytt. Another author spelt *tongue* in the following ways: *tung, tong, tunge, tonge, tounge*. The word *head* was variously spelt *hed, heede, hede, hefode*. The spellings *obay, survey, pray, vai, vain*, are often used for *obey, survey, pray, veil, vein*. *Ou* and *ow* are used indifferently.

It may be useful, however, to quote the testimonials of practical men in order to show that this system of spelling has really become one of the greatest national misfortunes, swallowing up millions of money every year, and blighting all attempts at national education. Mr. Edward Jones, a schoolmaster of great experience, having then the superintendence of the Hibernian Schools, Liverpool, wrote in the year 1868 :—

“The Government has for the last twenty years taken education under its care. They divided the subjects of instruction into six grades. The highest point that was attempted in the Government schools was that a pupil should be able to read with tolerable ease and expression a passage from a newspaper, and to spell the same with a tolerable amount of accuracy.”

Let us look at the results as they appear in the report of the Committee of Council on Education for 1870-71 :—

Schools or Departments under separate head teachers in England and Wales inspected during the year ending August 31, 1870	15,287
Certificated, assistant, and pupil teachers employed in these schools	28,033
Scholars in daily average attendance throughout the year	1,168,981
Scholars present on the day of inspection	1,473,883
Scholars presented for examination :—	
Under ten years of age	473,444
Over ten years of age	292,144
	<hr/>
	765,588
Scholars presented for Standard VI. :—	
Under ten years of age	227
Over ten years of age	32,953
	<hr/>
	33,180
Scholars who passed in Standard VI. :—	
1. Reading a short paragraph from a newspaper	30,985
2. Writing the same from dictation	27,989
3. Arithmetic	22,839

Therefore, less than one scholar for each teacher, and less than two scholars for each school inspected, reached Standard VI.

In 1873 the state of things, according to the official returns of the Education Department, was much the same. First of all, there ought to have been at school 4,600,000 children between the ages of three and thirteen. The number of children on the register of inspected schools was 2,218,598. Out of that number, about 200,000 leave school annually, their education being supposed to be finished. Out of these 200,000, ninety per cent. leave without reaching the 6th Standard, eighty per cent. without reaching the 5th, and sixty per cent. without reaching the 4th Standard.

The report for 1874-75 shows an increase of children on the books, but the proportion of children passing in the various standards is substantially the same. (See “Popular Education,” by E. Jones, B.A., an ex-schoolmaster, 1875.) It is calculated that for such results as

these the country, whether by taxation or by voluntary contributions, pays annually nearly £3,500,000.

According to the same authority, Mr. E. Jones, it now takes from six to seven years to learn the arts of reading and spelling with a fair degree of intelligence—i.e., about 2,000 hours; and to many minds the difficulties of orthography are insurmountable. The bulk of the children pass through the Government schools without having acquired the ability to read with ease and intelligence.

After a careful examination of young men and women from thirteen to twenty years of age in the factories of Birmingham, it was proved that only four and a half per cent. were able to read a simple sentence from an ordinary school-book with intelligence and accuracy.

This applies to the lower classes. But with regard to the higher classes the case seems almost worse; for Dr. Morell, in his "Manual of Spelling," asserts that out of 1,972 failures in the Civil Service examinations, 1,866 candidates were plucked for spelling.

So much for the pupils. Among the teachers themselves it was found in America that out of one hundred common words, the best speller among the eighty or ninety teachers examined failed in one, some prize-takers failed in four or five, and some others missed over forty. The Deputy State Superintendent declared that on an average the teachers of the State would fail in spelling to the extent of twenty-five per cent.

What, however, is even more serious than all this is, not the great waste of time in learning to read, and the almost complete failure in national education, but the actual mischief done by subjecting young minds to the illogical and tedious drudgery of learning to read English as spelt at present. Everything they have to learn in reading (or pronunciation) and spelling is irrational; one rule contradicts the other, and each statement has to be accepted simply on authority, and with a complete disregard of all those rational instincts which lie dormant in the child, and ought to be awakened by every kind of healthy exercise.

I know there are persons who can defend anything, and who hold that it is due to this very discipline that the English character is what it is: that it retains respect for authority; that it does not require a reason for everything; and that it does not admit that what is inconceivable is therefore impossible. Even English orthodoxy has been traced back to that hidden source, because a child accustomed to believe that t, h, o, u, g, h, is *though*, and that t, h, r, o, u, g, h, is *through*, would afterwards believe anything. It may be so; still I doubt whether even such objects would justify such means. Lord Lytton says, "A more lying, round-about, puzzle-headed delusion than that by which we confuse the clear instincts of truth in our accursed system of spelling was never concocted by the father of falsehood. . . . How can a system of education flourish that begins by so monstrous a falsehood, which the sense of hearing suffices to contradict?"

The question, then, that will have to be answered sooner or

later is this:—Can this unsystematic system of spelling English be allowed to go on for ever? Is every English child, as compared with other children, to be mulcted in two or three years of his life in order to learn it? Are the lower classes to go through school without learning to read and write their own language intelligently? And is the country to pay millions every year for this utter failure of national education? I do not believe that such a state of things will be allowed to continue for ever, particularly as a remedy is at hand—a remedy that has now been tested for twenty or thirty years, and that has answered extremely well. I mean Mr. Pitman's system of phonetic writing, as applied to English.

I give his alphabet, which comprehends the thirty-eight broad, typical sounds of the English language, and assigns to each a definite sign. With these thirty-eight signs, English can be written rationally and read easily; and, what is most important, it has been proved by an experience of many years, by numerous publications, and by practical experiments in teaching both children and adults, that such a system as Mr. Pitman's is perfectly practical.

THE PHONETIC ALPHABET.

The phonetic letters in the first column are pronounced like the italic letters in the words that follow. The last column contains the names of the letters.

CONSONANTS.

Mutes.

P	p	rope.....	pi
B	b	rob.....	bi
T	t	fate.....	ti
D	d	fade.....	di
C	ç	etch.....	çe
J	j	edge.....	jε
K	k	leek.....	kε
G	g	league.....	ge

Continuants.

F	f	safc.....	ef
V	v	savc.....	vi
Ŧ	t	wreath.....	it
Ƨ	d	wreathe.....	di
S	s	hiss.....	cs
Z	z	his.....	zi
Σ	f	vicious.....	if
Ξ	z	vision.....	zi

Nasals.

M	m	seem.....	em
N	n	seen.....	en
Ũ	ŋ	sing.....	in

DIPHTHONGS: Ƨ i, as heard in by,

Liquids.

L	l	fall.....	el
R	r	rare.....	ar

Coalescents.

W	w	wet.....	we
Y	y	yct.....	ye

Aspirate.

H	h	hay.....	εç
---	---	----------	----

VOWELS.

A	a	am.....	at
Α	α	alms.....	as
E	e	ell.....	et
Ε	ε	ale.....	ε
I	i	ill.....	it
ι	i	eel.....	i
O	o	on.....	ot
Ω	ω	all.....	o
Ƨ	ɔ	up.....	ɔt
Ο	σ	ope.....	σ
U	u	full.....	ut
Ũ	u	food.....	u

U u, OU ou, OI oi.
new, now, boy.

SPECIMEN OF PHONETIC PRINTING.

Ov let yirz de hol ssubjekt ov Fonetiks haz bin teken ep wid inkrist ardor bi sjentifik men, and asolts hav bin med [ɛpon de komon "efit and korspt speliŋ"] bi tri diferent armiz, filolojists, fiziolojists, and matematifanz.

Ɔ ot not tu ɔmit hir tu mɛnʃon de valubel servisez renderd bi ɔɔz hu, for nirli twenti yirz, hav bin leboriŋ in Igglanɔ tu tɔɔn de rezɔlts ov sjentifik reserɔ tu praktikal ɔs, in deviziŋ and propagetiŋ a nu sistem ov "Brif Riŋiŋ and tru Speliŋ," best nɔn ɔnder de nem ov de *Fonetik Reform*. Ɔ am far from ɔnderretiŋ de difiksɔltiz ɔat stand in de we ov sɔɔ a reform, and i am not sɔ saggwɛn az tu indɔli in eni hɔps ov siŋ it karid for de nekst tri or fɔɔr jeneresiɔnz. Bɔt i fil konvɛnst ov de truɔ and rizonabelnes ov de prinsipelz on whiɔ ɔat reform rests, and az de innɛt regard for truɔ and rizon, hɔuever dormant or timid at tiɔmz, haz ɔlwez pruuvd irrezistibel in de enɔ, enɛbliŋ men tu part wiɔ ɔf de hɔld mɔst ɔir and sekred, whɛɔer korn lɔz, or Stɔuart ɔinastiz, or pepal leɔets, or hiden iɔolz, i ɔout not ɔat de efɛt and kɔrspt ɔrtoɔrafi wil folɔ in ɔɔɔ tɔɔn. Nesɔnz hav befor nou ɔenjd ɔɔr numɛrikal figurz, ɔɔr leterz, ɔɔr kronoloji, ɔɔr wɛts and mezurz; and ɔɔ Mr Pitman mɛ not liv tu si de rezɔlts ov hiz persɛviriŋ and disinterested ekzerɔniŋ, it rekwiɔz nɔ profetik pouer tu persɛv ɔat whot at prezɛnt iz puɔpuɔd bi de mɛni, wil mɛk its we in de enɔ, ɔnles mɛt bi arguments strongɔr ɔan ɔɔz hidertu leveld at de *Fonetik Nɔz*. Wɛn argument whiɔ mɛt bi sɔpɔzɔd tu we wiɔ de stuɔɔdent ov langweji, nemli, de obskɔresɔn ov de etimolojiikal strɔktɔr ov wɔɔrdz, i kanot konsider veri formidabel. De prɔnɔnsiɔniŋ ov langwejez ɔenjez akordiŋ tu fikst lɔz, de speliŋ iz ɔenjd in de mɔst arbitrari manɛr, sɔ ɔat if our speliŋ folɔɔ de prɔnɔnsiɔniŋ ov wɔɔrdz, it wud in rialiti bi a greter help tu de kritikal stuɔɔdent ov langweji ɔan de prezɛnt ɔnsɛrtɛn and ɔnsjentifik mɔɔ ov riŋiŋ.—*Maks Myler's Sekond Siriz ov "Lektɔrz on de Sjens ov Langweji," deliverd at de Roial Institɔʃon, Lɔndon, 1863.*

Now I ask any intellɔgent reader who ɔoes not think that ɔverything new and strange is, *ipso facto*, ridiculous and absurd, whɛɔer, after a few ɔays' practice, he or she wouɔ not read and write English, according to Mr. Pitman's sistem, with perfect ease? Of ɔourse it takes more than five minutes to mɛster it, and more than five minutes to form an opiniɔn of its merits. But admitting even that peɔple of a certain age shouɔ find this new alphabet troublesome, we must not forget that no reform can be carried without a generation or two of martyrs; and what true reformers have to think of is not themselves, but those who come after them—those, in fact, who are now growing up to inherit hereafter, whɛɔer they like it or not, all the good and all the evil whiɔ we choose to leave to them.

It might be said, hɔuever, that Mr. Pitman's sistem, being entirely phonetic, is too radical a reform, and that many and the worst irregularities in English spelling ɔould be removed without

going quite so far. The principle that half a loaf is better than no bread is not without some truth, and in many cases we know that a policy of compromise has been productive of very good results. But, on the other hand, this half-hearted policy has often retarded a real and complete reform of existing abuses; and in the case of a reform of spelling, I almost doubt whether the difficulties inherent in half measures are not as great as the difficulties of carrying a complete reform. If the world is not ready for reform, let us wait. It seems far better, and at all events far more honest, to wait till it is ready than to carry the reluctant world with you a little way, and then to find that all the impulsive force is spent, and the greater part of the abuses established on firmer ground than ever.

Mr. Jones,¹ who represents the conciliatory reformers of spelling, would be satisfied with a moderate scheme of spelling reform, in which, by observing analogy and following precedent in altering a comparatively small number of words, it would be possible to simplify orthography to a considerable extent without applying any new principle, or introducing new letters, and yet to reduce the time and labour in teaching reading and spelling by at least one-half. It might at all events be possible to settle the spelling of those two to three thousand words which at present are spelt differently by different authorities. This scheme, advocated by Mr. Jones, is certainly very clever; and if it had a chance of success, I myself should consider it a great step in advance. My only doubt is whether, in a case like this, a small measure of reform would be carried more easily than a complete reform. It is different in German, where the disease has not spread so far. Here the committee appointed by Government to consider the question of a reform of spelling has declared in favour of some such moderate principles as Mr. Jones advocates for English. In English, however, the difficulty lies in changing anything; and if the principle of any change is once admitted, it would really be easier, I believe, to begin *de novo* than to change something, and leave the rest unchanged.

Let us now see how Mr. Pitman's or any similar system of phonetic writing has worked where it has been put to the test.

Mr. Wm. White writes:—"I speak from experience. I have taught poor children in Glasgow to read the Sermon on the Mount after a course of exercises extending over no more than six hours."

The following is an extract from a letter written some time ago by the late Mr. Wm. Colbourn, manager of the Dorset Bank at Stourminster, to a friend of his, a schoolmaster. He says:—

"My little Sidney, who is now a few months more than four years old, will read any phonetic book without the slightest hesitation; the hardest names or the longest words in the Old or New Testament form no obstacle to him. And how long do you think it took me—for I am his teacher—to impart to

(1) "Popular Education. A Revision of English Spelling a National Necessity." By E. Jones, B.A. London, 1876.

him this power? Why, something less than eight hours! You may believe it or not as you like, but I am confident that not more than that amount of time was spent on him, and that was in snatches of five minutes at a time, while tea was getting ready. I know you will be inclined to say, 'All that is very well, but what is the use of reading phonetic books? he is still as far off, and may be farther, from reading romanic books.' But in this you are mistaken. Take another example. His next elder brother, a boy of six years, has had a phonetic education so far. What is the consequence? Why, reading in the first stage was so delightful and easy a thing to him, that he taught himself to read romanically, and it would be a difficult matter to find one boy in twenty, of a corresponding age, that could read half so well as he can in any book. Again, my oldest boy has written more phonetic shorthand and long-hand, perhaps, than any boy of his age (eleven years) in the kingdom; and no one I daresay has had less to do with that absurdity of absurdities, the spelling-book! He is now at a first-rate school in Wiltshire, and in the half-year preceding Christmas, he carried off the prize for orthography in a contest with boys some of them his seniors by years!"

Mr. A. J. Ellis, than whom no one has laboured more devotedly for a reform of spelling, as a first step in a reform of national education, and who has himself elaborated several most ingenious systems of phonetic writing, gives us the following as the results of his practical experience:—

"Careful experiments in teaching children of various ages and ranks, and even paupers and criminal adults, have established—

"1. That pupils may be taught to read books in phonetic print, slowly but surely, in from ten to forty hours, and will attain considerable fluency after a few weeks' practice.

"2. That when the pupils have attained fluency in reading from phonetic print, a very few hours suffice to give them the same fluency in reading ordinary print.

"3. That the whole time necessary for imparting a knowledge of both phonetic and ordinary reading does not exceed eight months for children of average intelligence, between four and five years of age, taught in class, at school, not more than half an hour to an hour each day; and that in this time an ability to read is acquired superior to that usually attained in two or three times the period on the old plan; while the pronunciation of the pupil is much improved, his interest in his study is kept alive, and a logical training of enduring value is given to his mind by the habitual analysis and synthesis of spoken sounds.

"4. That those taught to read in this manner acquire the art of ordinary spelling more readily than those instructed on the old method."

There remains, therefore, this one objection only, that whatever the practical and whatever the theoretical advantages of the phonetic system may be, it would utterly destroy the historical or etymological character of the English language.

Suppose it did; what then? The Reformation is supposed to have destroyed the historical character of the English Church, and that sentimental grievance is still felt by some students of ecclesiastical antiquities. But did England, did all the really progressive nations of Europe allow this sentimental grievance to outweigh the practical and theoretical advantages of Protestant Reform? Language is not made for scholars and etymologists; and if the whole race of English etymologists were really to be swept away by the introduction of a spelling reform, I hope they would be the first to rejoice in sacrificing themselves in so good a cause.

But is it really the case that the historical continuity of the English language would be broken by the adoption of phonetic spelling, and that the profession of the etymologist would be gone for ever? I say, No, most emphatically, to both propositions. If the science of language has proved anything, it has proved that all languages change according to law, and with considerable uniformity. If, therefore, the writing followed, *pari passu*, on the changes in pronunciation, what is called the etymological consciousness of the speakers and the readers—I speak, of course, of educated people only—would not suffer in the least. If we retain the feeling of an etymological connection between *gentlemanly* and *gentlemanlike*, we should surely retain it whether we write *gentlemanly* or *gentlemanli*. If we feel that *think* and *thought*, *bring* and *brought*, *buy* and *bought*, *freight* and *fraught*, belong together, should we feel it less if we wrote *thot*, *bröt*, *böt*, *frot*? If, in speaking, those who know Latin retain the feeling that words ending in *ation* correspond to Latin words in *atio*, would they lose the feeling if they saw the same words spelt with “*eson*?” or even *esyn*? Do they not recognise *Latia itia* in *-ice*; or *ilis* in *le*, as in *-able*? If the scholar knows, at once, that such words as *barbarous*, *anxious*, *circus*, *genius*, are of Latin origin, would he hesitate if the last syllable in all of them were uniformly written “*ys*”? Nay, is not the present spelling of *barbarous* and *anxious* entirely misleading, by confounding words ending in *-osus*, such as famous (*famosus*) with words ending in *-us*, like *barbarous*, *anxious*, &c.? Because the Italians write *filosofo*, are they less aware than the English, who write *philosopher*, and the French, who write *philosophic*, that they have before them the Latin *philosophus*, the Greek *φιλόσοφος*? If we write *f* in *fancy*, why not in *phantom*? if in *frenzy* and *frantic*, why not in *phrenology*? A language which tolerates *vial* for *phial*, need not shiver at *filosofer*. Every educated speaker knows that such words as *honour*, *ardour*, *colour*, *odour*, *labour*, *vigour*, *error*, *emperor*, have passed from Latin to French, and from French to English. Would he know it less if all were spelt alike, such as *honor* (*honorable*), *ardor*, *rigor* (*rigorous*), *labor* (*laborious*) or even “*onxr*, *ardsr*, *vigxr*? The old spelling of *emperor*, *doctor*, *governor*, and *error*, was *emperour*, *doctour*, *governour*, and *errour*. If these could be changed, why not the rest? Spenser has *neibor* for *neighbour*, and it is difficult to say what was gained by changing *-bor* into *-bour* in such purely Saxon words as *neighbour*, *harbour*. No doubt if we see *laugh* written with *gh* at the end, those who know German are at once reminded of its etymological connection with the German *lachen*; but we should soon know the same by analogy, if we found not only “*lsf*,” but “*kof*” for *cough* (G. *keuchen*), “*enxf*” for *enough* (G. *genug*), &c. In “*drafft*,” phonetic spelling has nearly supplanted the so-called historical spelling *draught*; in “*dwarf*” (*dicergh*, *thueorh*) and in “*rxsf*” (*rough*) altogether.

What people call the etymological consciousness of the speaker

is strictly a matter of oratorical sentiment only, and it would remain nearly as strong as it is now, whatever spelling be adopted. But even if it should suffer here and there, we ought to bear in mind that, except for oratorical purposes, that consciousness, confined as it is to a very few educated people, is of very small importance, unless it has first been corrected by a strict etymological discipline. Without that, it often degenerates into what is called "popular etymology," and actually tends, in some cases, to vitiate the correct spelling of words.

I have frequently dwelt on this before, in order to show how, what is now called the etymological or historical spelling of words, is, in many cases, utterly unetymological and unhistorical. We spell *to delight*, and thus induce many people to believe that this word is somehow connected with *light* (*lux*), or *light* (*levis*); whereas the old spelling was *to delyt* or *to delite* (Tyndale), representing the old French *deleiter*. On the other hand we find for *quite* and *smite*, the old spelling *quight*, *smight*, which may be old and historical, but is decidedly unetymological.

Sovereign and *foreign* are spelt as if they were connected with *reign* (*regnum*); the true etymology of the former being *superanus*, Old French *sovrain*, Old English *soveraine*; while *foreign* is the late Latin *foraneus*; Old French, *forain*; Old English, *forein*. And why do we write *to feign*? Archbishop Trench ("English Past and Present," p. 238) thinks the *g* in *feign* is eloquent to the eye; but its eloquence is misleading. *To feign* is not taken from Latin *fungo*, as little as *honour* is taken from Latin *honor*. *To feign* comes from the Old French *faindre*; it was in Old English *fayner* and *feyner*, and it was therefore a mere etymological point, to insert the *g* of the Latin *fungo*, and the French *feignant*. The Old English *shammfast* (Orm.), formed like *stedefast* (steadfast), is now spelt *shamefaced*, as if it had something to do with a blushing face. *Aghast*, instead of the Old English *agast*, is supposed to look more frightful because it reminds us of *ghost*. The French *lanterne* was written *lant-horn*, as if it had been so called from the transparent sheets of horn that enclosed the light. The *s* in *island* owes its origin to a mistaken belief that the word is connected with *isle* (*insula*), whereas it is the A.S. *ealand* (Ger. *eiland*), that is, water-land. The spelling *iland* was still current in Shakespeare's time. In *aisle*, too, the *s* is unetymological, though it is historical, as having been taken over from the Old French *aisle*.

This tendency to alter the spelling in order to impart to a word, at all hazards, an etymological character, begins even in Latin, where *postumus*, a superlative of *post*, was sometimes written *posthumus*, as if, when applied to a late-born son, it was derived from *humus*. In English, this false spelling is retained in *posthumous*. *Cena* was spelt by people who wanted to show their knowledge of Greek, *cana*, as if connected with *κοινή*.

But now let us look more carefully into the far more important

statement, that the English language, if written phonetically, would really lose its historical and etymological character. The first question is, in what sense can the present spelling of English be called historical? We have only to go back a very short way in order to see the modern upstart character of what is called historical spelling. We now write *pleasure*, *measure*, and *feather*, but not very long ago, in Spenser's time, these words were spelt *plesure*, *mesure*, *fether*. Tyndale wrote *frute*; the *i* in *fruit* is a mere restoration of the French spelling. For *debt*, on the contrary, we find, but three, or four hundred years ago, *dett*. This is more historical therefore than *debt*, because in French, from which the word was borrowed, the *b* had disappeared, and it was a purely etymological fancy to restore it. The *b* was likewise re-introduced in *doubt*, but the *p* was not restored into *count* (Fr. *compter*, Lat. *computare*), where *p* had at least the same right as *b* in *doute*. Thus *receipt* resumes the Latin *p*, but *deceit* does without it. There is another *b* which has a certain historical air in some English words, but which was originally purely phonetic, and is now simply superfluous. The old word for *member* was *lim*. In such compounds as *lim-lama*, *lim(b)-lame*, *lim-leas* *lim(b)less*, it was impossible to avoid the intercalation of a *b* in pronunciation. In this manner the *b* crept in, and we have now to teach that in *limb*, *crumb* (*crume*), *thumb* (*thuma*) the *b* must be written, but not pronounced. Again, *tung* (Ger. *zunge*), *yung* (Ger. *jung*), as spelt by Spenser, have a more historical aspect than *tongue* and *young*.

If we wished to write historically, we ought to write *salm* instead of *psalm*, for the initial *p*, being lost in pronunciation, was dropt in writing at a very early time (Anglo-Saxon *sealm*), and was re-introduced simply to please some ecclesiastical etymologists.

In what sense can it be called historical spelling if the old plurals of *mouse* and *louse*, which were *mys* and *lys*, are now spelt *mice* and *lice*? The plural of *goose* is not spelt *geece*, but *geese*, yet everybody knows how to pronounce it. The same mistaken attempt at an occasional phonetic spelling has separated *dice* from *die*, and *pence* from *pens*, i.e. *penyes*; while in *nurse*, where the spelling *nurce* would have been useful, as reminding us of its true etymon, *nourrice*, the *c* has been replaced by *s*.

There are, in fact, many spellings which would be at the same time more historical and more phonetic. Why write *little*, when no one pronounces *little*, and when the old spelling was *lytel*? Why *girdle*, when the old spelling was *girdel*? The same rule applies to nearly all words ending in *le*, such as *sickle*, *ladle*, *apple*, &c., where the etymology is completely obscured by the present orthography. Why *scent*, but *dis-sent*, when even Milton still wrote *sent*? Why *ache*, instead of the Shakespearian *ake*? Why *cat*, but *kitten*; why *cow*, but *kine*? Why *accede*, *precede*, *secede*, but *exceed*, *proceed*, *succeed*? Why, indeed, except to waste the precious time of children?

And if it is difficult to say what constitutes historical spelling.

it is equally perplexing to define the real meaning of etymological spelling. For, where are we to stop? It would be considered very unetymological were we to write *nee* instead of *knee*, *now* instead of *knoie*, *night* instead of *knight*; yet no one complains about the loss of the initial *h*, the representative of an original *k*, in *loaf*, A.S. *hlāf* (cf. *κλίβανος*), in *ring*, A.S. *hring*; in *lade*, *ladder*, *neck*, &c.

If we are to write etymologically, then why not return to *loverd*, or *hlaforð*, instead of *lord*? to *nose-thrill*, or *nosethirle* instead of *nostril*; to *scister* instead of *sister*? which would not be more troublesome than *sicord*. *Wif-mann* surely would be better than *woman*; *meadwife* better than *midwife*; *godspel* better than *gospel*, *ortyard* better than *orchard*, *puisne* better than *puny*. Frequently the present recognised spelling looks etymological, but is utterly unetymological. *Righteous* looks like an adjective in *-eous*, such as *plenteous*, but it is really a Saxon word, *rightwis*, i.e. *rightwise*, formed like *otherwise*, &c.

Could is written with an *l* in analogy to *would*, but while the *l* is justified in *would* from *will*, and *should* from *shall*, we find the Old English imperfect of *can* written *cūthe*, then *couthē*, *coude*. The *l*, therefore, is neither phonetic nor etymological. Nothing, again, can be more misleading to an etymologist than the present spelling of *whole* and *hale*. Both come from the same source, the Gothic *hail-s*, Sanskrit *kalya-s* meaning originally, *fit*, *ready*; then *sound*, *complete*, *whole*. In Anglo-Saxon we have *hæl*, whole; and *hāl*, healthy, without any trace of a *u*, either before or after. The Old English *halsum*, wholesome, is the German *hailsam*. *Whole*, therefore, is a mere misspelling, the *u* having probably been added in analogy to *who*, *which*, &c. From a purely etymological point of view, the *u* is wrongly left out before *h* in *hoir*; for as Anglo-Saxon *hyc* became *why*, Anglo-Saxon *hwa* should have become *whor*.

If we really attempted to write etymologically, we should have to write *bridegroom* without the *r*, because *groom* is a mere corruption of *guma*, man, Anglo-Saxon *bryd-guma*. We should have to write *burse* instead of *purse*, as in *disburse*. In fact, it is difficult to say, where we should stop. Why not write *metal* instead of *mettle*, *worthship* instead of *worship*, *chirurgion* instead of *surgeon*, *furhlong* (i.e. furrow long) instead of *furlong*, *feordhing* (i.e. fourth part) instead of *farthing*? If we write *puny* *puisne*, we might as well write *post-natus*. We might spell *coy*, *quietus*; *pert*, *apertus*; *priest*, *presbyter*; *master*, *magister*; *sexton*, *sacristan*; *alms*, *eleemosyne*, &c. If anybody will tell me at what date etymological spelling is to begin, whether at 1500 A.D., or at 1000 A.D., or at 500 A.D., I am willing to discuss the question. Till then, I beg leave to say that etymological spelling would play greater havoc in English than phonetic spelling, even if we were to draw a line not more than five hundred years ago.

The two strongest arguments, therefore, against phonetic spelling, viz., that it would destroy the historical and etymological character of the English language, are, after all, but very partially true.

Here and there, no doubt, the etymology and history of an English word might be obscured by phonetic spelling; as if, for instance, we wrote "Urop" instead of *Europe*. But even then analogy would help us, and teach those who know Greek, of whom there are not many, that "Ur" in such words as *Europe*, *Eurydice*, represented the Greek *εὐρύς*. The real answer, however, is, that no one could honestly call the present system of spelling either historical or etymological; and I believe that, taken as a whole, the loss occasioned by consistent phonetic spelling would hardly be greater than the gain.

Another objection urged against phonetic spelling, viz., that with it it would be impossible to distinguish homonyms, must be met in the same way. No doubt it is a certain advantage if in writing we can distinguish *right*, *rite*, *write*, and *wright*. But if, in the hurry of conversation, there is hardly ever a doubt which word is meant, surely there would be much less danger in the slow process of reading a continuous sentence. If various spellings of the same word are necessary to point out different meanings, we should require eight spellings for *box*, to signify a chest, a Christmas gift, a hunting seat, a tree, a slap, to sail round, seats in a theatre, and the front seat on a coach; and this principle would have to be applied to above six hundred words. Who would undertake to provide all these variations of the present uniform spelling of these words? And we must not forget that, after all, in reading a page we are seldom in doubt whether *sole* means a fish, or the *sole* of a foot, or is used as an adjective. If there is at any time any real difficulty, language provides its own remedy. It either drops such words as *rite* and *sole*, replacing them by *ceremony* and *only*, or it uses a periphrastic expression, such as the sole of the foot, or the sole and only ground, &c.

Thus far I have tried to answer the really important arguments which have been brought forward against phonetic spelling. I have done so with special reference to the powerful remonstrances of Archbishop Trench, and his most able pleading in favour of the established system of orthography. As a mere scholar, I fully share his feelings, and I sincerely admire his eloquent advocacy. I differ from him because I do not think, as he does, that the loss entailed by phonetic spelling would be so great as we imagine; or that it would be all on one side. Besides, unless he can show how a reform of spelling is not only for the present to be avoided, but altogether to be rendered unnecessary, I consider that the sooner it is taken in hand the better. It seems to me that the Archbishop looks on the introduction of phonetic spelling as a mere crotchet of a few scholars, or as an attempt on the part of some half-educated persons, wishing to avoid the trouble of learning how to spell correctly. If that were so, I quite agree with him that public opinion would never assume sufficient force for carrying their scheme. But there is a motive power behind these phonetic reformers which the Archbishop has

hardly taken into account. I mean the misery endured by millions of children at school, who might learn in one year, and with real advantage to themselves, what they now require four or five years to learn, and seldom succeed in learning after all. If the evidence of such men as Mr. Ellis is to be depended on, and I believe they are willing to submit to any test, then surely the loss of some historical and etymological *souvenirs* would weigh little against the happiness of millions of children, and the still higher happiness of millions of Englishmen and Englishwomen, growing up as the heirs to all the wealth and strength of English literature, or unable to read even their Bible. Here it is where I venture to differ from the Archbishop, not as being sanguine as to any immediate success, but simply as feeling it a duty to help in a cause which at present is most unpopular. The evil day may be put off for a long time, particularly if the weight of such men as Archbishop Trench is thrown into the other scale. But unless language ceases to be language, and writing ceases to be writing, the day will surely come when peace will have to be made between the two. Germany has appointed a Government Commission to consider what is to be done with German spelling. In America, too, some leading statesmen seem inclined to take up the reform of spelling on national grounds. Is there no statesman in England sufficiently proof against ridicule to call the attention of Parliament to what is a growing national misfortune?

Much, however, as I differ from the Archbishop on these grounds, I cannot sufficiently deprecate the tone in which his powerful opposition has been met by many of the upholders of phonetic spelling. Nay, I must go still further, and frankly confess that to one of his arguments I find it difficult, at present, to give a satisfactory answer.

"It is a mere assumption," the Archbishop remarks, "that all men pronounce all words alike; or that whenever they come to spell a word they will exactly agree as to what the outline of its sound is. Now we are sure men will not do this, from the fact that, before there was any fixed and settled orthography in our language, when, therefore, everybody was more or less a phonographer, seeking to write down the word as it sounded to *him*, for he had no other law to guide him, the variations of spelling are infinite. Take, for instance, the word *sudden*, which does not seem to promise any great scope for variety. I have myself met with this word spelt in no less than fourteen ways among our early writers. Again, in how many ways was Raleigh's name spelt, or Shakspeare's? The same is evident from the spelling of uneducated persons in our own day. They have no other rule but the sound to guide them. How is it that they do not all spell alike?"—(English Past and Present, p. 203.)

Like most men who plead with their heart as well as with their head, the Archbishop has here overlooked one obvious answer to his question. They do not spell alike because they have been brought up with a system of spelling in which the same sound can be represented in ten different ways, and in which hardly any one letter is restricted to one phonetic power only. If children were brought up with an alphabet in which each letter had but one sound, and in

which the same sound was always represented by the same sign—and this is the very essence of phonetic writing—then it would be simply impossible that they should dream of writing *sudden* in 14, or *Woburn* in 140, different ways.

But for all that there is some truth in the Archbishop's remark; and if we compare the different ways in which the advocates of phonetic spelling—men like Pitman, Bell, Ellis, Withers, Jones—write the same words, even when using the same phonetic alphabet, we shall see that the difficulty pointed out by the Archbishop is a real one. Every one knows how differently the same words always have been and still are pronounced in different parts of England. And it is not only in towns and counties that these peculiarities prevail; there are certain words which one family pronounces differently from another; and there are besides the studied and unstudied peculiarities of individual speakers. To convince people that one pronunciation is right and the other wrong, seems utterly hopeless. I have heard a highly cultivated man defending his dropping the *h* at the beginning of certain words, by the unanswerable argument that in the place where he was brought up, no one pronounced these initial *h*'s. What Scotchman would admit that his pronunciation was faulty? What Irishman would submit to laws of spelling passed in London? And what renders argument on any niceties of pronunciation still more difficult is, that both the ear and the tongue are most treacherous witnesses. I have heard Americans maintain in good earnest that there was much less of nasal twang in America than in England. People are not aware how they pronounce, and how differently they pronounce one and the same word. As a foreigner I have had ample opportunities for observation on this point. Some friends would tell me, for instance, that *world* was pronounced like *whirl'd*, *father* like *farther*, *nor* (before consonants) like *gnaw*, *bud* like *bird*, *burst* like *bust*, *for* like *fur*, *birth* like *berth*; that the vowels had the same sound in *where* and *there*, in *not* and *war*, in *God* and *gaudy*; while others assured me that no one but a foreigner could think so. And the worst is that even the same person does not always pronounce the same word in exactly the same manner. Constantly, when I asked a friend to repeat a word which he had just pronounced, he would pronounce it again, but with a slight difference. The mere fact of his trying to pronounce well would give to his pronunciation a conscious and emphatic character. The preposition *of* is pronounced by most people "*uv*," but if cross-examined, many will say that they pronounce *ov*, but the *o* not exactly like *off*.

The confusion becomes greatest when it is attempted to identify the pronunciation, say of a vowel in German with a vowel in English. No two Englishmen and no two Germans seemed to be able to agree on what they heard with their ears, or what they said with their tongues; and the result in the end is that no vowel in German was really the same as any other vowel in English. To take one or two instances from Mr.

Ellis's key to Palæotypè, I can hear no difference between the *a* in Italian *mano*, English *father*, and German *mahnen*, unless I restrict my observations to the utterance of certain individuals; whereas I do hear a very decided, and generally adopted, difference between the vowels in German *böcke* and French *jeune*. Mr. Ellis, touching on the same difficulty, remarks, "Mr. Bell's pronunciation, in many instances, differs from that which I am accustomed to give, especially in foreign words. Both of us may be wrong." Mr. Sweet remarks, page 10, "Mr. Ellis insists strongly on the monophthongic character of his own *ees* and *oos*. I hear his *ee* and *oo* as distinct diphthongs, not only in his English pronunciation, but also in his pronunciation of French, German, and Latin." If phonetic writing meant this minute photography of spoken sounds, in which Messrs. Bell and Ellis excel; if any attempt had ever been made to employ this hair-splitting machinery for a practical reform of English spelling, the objections raised by Archbishop Trench would be quite unanswerable. There would be fifty different ways of spelling English, and the confusion would be greater than it is now. Not even Mr. Bell's thirty-six categories of vowel sound would be sufficient to render every peculiarity of vowel quality, pitch, and quantity, with perfect accuracy." (See H. Sweet, "History of English Sounds," pp. 58, 68.) But this was never intended, and while conceding much to the Archbishop's arguments, I must not concede too much.

What I like in Mr. Pitman's system of spelling is exactly what I know has been found fault with by others, viz., that he does not attempt to refine too much, and to express in writing those endless shades of pronunciation which may be of the greatest interest to the student of acoustics, or of phonetics, as applied to the study of living dialects, but which, for practical as well as for scientific philological purposes, must be entirely ignored. Writing was never intended to photograph spoken languages: it was meant to indicate, not to paint, sounds. If Voltaire says, "*L'écriture c'est la peinture de la voix*," he is right; but when he goes on to say, "*plus elle est ressemblante, meilleure elle est*," I am not certain that, as in a picture of a landscape, so in a picture of the voice, a pre-Raphaelite minuteness may not destroy the very object of the picture. Language deals in broad colours, and writing ought to follow the example of language, which, though it allows an endless variety of pronunciation, restricts itself for its own purpose, for the purpose of expressing thought in all its modifications, to a very limited number of typical vowels and consonants. Out of the large number of vowel sounds, for instance, which have been catalogued from the various English dialects, those only can be recognised as constituent elements of the language which in, and by, their difference from each other convey a difference of meaning. Of such pregnant and thought-conveying vowels, English possesses no more than twelve. Whatever the minor shades of vowel sounds in English dialects may be, they do not enrich the

language as such, *i.e.*, they do not enable the speaker to convey more minute shades of thought than the twelve typical single vowels. Besides, there generally is what the French might call a phonetic solidarity in each dialect. If one vowel changes, the others are apt to follow, and the main object of language remains the same throughout, *viz.*, to prevent one word from running into another, and yet to abstain from minute phonetic distinctions, which an ordinary ear might find it difficult to grasp. This principle of phonetic solidarity is of great importance, not only in explaining the gradual changes of vowels, but also such general changes of consonants as we see, for instance, in the German *Lautverschiebung*. As soon as one place is left vacant, there is pressure to fill it, or so much of it as is left vacant, but no more.

There are, in fact, two branches, or at all events, two quite distinct practical applications of the science of Phonetics, which, for want of better names, I designate as *philological* and *dialectical*. There is what may be called a philological study of Phonetics, which is an essential part of the Science of Language, and has for its object to give a clear idea of the alphabet, not as written, but as spoken. It treats of the materials out of which, the instruments with which, and the process by which, vowels and consonants are formed; and after explaining how certain letters agree, and differ, in their material, in the instruments with which, and the process by which they are produced, it enables us to understand the causes and the results of what is called Phonetic Change. In many respects the most instructive treatment of the general theory of Phonetics is to be found in the *Prātisākhya*s; particularly in the oldest (400 B.C.), that attached to the *Rig Veda*.¹ Though the number of possible sounds may seem infinite, the number of real sounds used in Sanskrit or any other given language for the purpose of expressing different shades of meaning, is very limited. It is with these broad categories of sound alone that the *Prātisākhya*s deal; and it is for a proper understanding of these that the Science of Language has to include within its sphere a careful study of Phonetics.

The dialectical study of Phonetics has larger objects. It wishes to exhaust all possible sounds which can be produced by the vocal organs, little concerned as to whether these sounds occur in any real language or not. It is particularly useful for the purpose of painting, with the utmost accuracy, the actual pronunciation of individuals, and of fixing the faintest shades of dialectic variety. The most marvellous achievement in this branch of applied phonetics may be seen in Mr. Bell's "Visible Speech."

These two branches of phonetic science, however, should be kept carefully distinct. As the foundation of a practical alphabet, like-

(1) "*Rig-Veda-Prātisākhya*, Das älteste Lehrbuch der Vedischen Phonetik, Sanskrit Text mit Übersetzung und Anmerkungen, herausgegeben," von F. Max Müller. Leipzig, 1869.

wise as the only safe foundation for the Science of Language, we want philological or theoretic Phonetics. We want an understanding of those general principles and those broad categories of sound which are treated in the *Prātisākhya*s; we do not want any of the minute dialectic distinctions which have no grammatical purpose, and are therefore outside the pale of grammatical science.

But when we want to exhaust all possible shades of sound, when we want to photograph the peculiarities of certain dialects, or measure the deviations in the pronunciation of individuals by the most minute degrees, we then must avail ourselves of that exquisite artistic machinery constructed by Mr. Bell, and handled with so much skill by Mr. A. J. Ellis, though few only will be able to use it with real success.

I have sometimes been blamed for having insisted on Phonetics being recognised as the foundation of the Science of Language. Professor Benfey and other scholars protested against the chapter I had devoted to Phonetics in the Second Series of my Lectures, as an unnecessary innovation, and those protests have become still stronger of late. But here, too, we must distinguish between two things. Philological or general Phonetics are, I hold as strongly as ever, an integral part of the Science of Language; dialectic Phonetics may be useful here and there, but they should be kept within their proper sphere; otherwise, I admit as readily as any one else, they obscure rather than reveal the broad and massive colours of sound which language uses for its ordinary work.

If we reflect a little, we shall see that the philological conception of a vowel is something totally different from its purely acoustic or dialectic conception. The former is chiefly concerned with the sphere of possible variation, and the latter with the purely phenomenal individuality of each vowel. To the philologist the three vowels in *septimus*, for instance, whatever their exact pronunciation may have been at different times, and in different provinces of the Roman Empire, are potentially one and the same. We look on *septimus* and *ἑβδομος* as on Sanskrit *saptamas*, and only by knowing that *e*, *i*, and *u* in *septimus* are all representatives of a short *a*, or that *optimus* stands for the more ancient *optumus* and *optomos*, do we take in at one glance the whole history and possible variation of these vowels in different languages and dialects. Even where a vowel disappears completely, as in *gigno* for *gigeno*, in *πίπτω* for *πιπετω*, the mental eye of the philologist discerns and weighs what no ear can hear. And while in these cases the etymologist, disregarding the clearest variety of pronunciation, treats such vowels as *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u* as one and the same, in others where two vowels seem to have exactly the same sound to the dialectician, the philologist on his part perceives differences of the greatest importance. The *i* in *fides* and *cliens* may have the same sound as the *i* in *gigno* or *septimus*, the *u* of *luo* may not differ from the *u* in *optumus* or *lubens*, but their intrinsic value, their capabilities of

growth and decay, are totally different in each. We shall never be able to speak with anything like real scientific accuracy of the pronunciation of ancient languages, but even if we look to their written appearance only, we see again and again how vowels, written alike, are historically totally distinct. Grimm introduced the distinction between *ái* and *ai*, between *áu* and *au*, not because it is by any means certain that the pronunciation of these diphthongs varied, but because he wished to indicate that the antecedents of *ái* and *áu* were different from those of *ai* and *au*. In Gothic *faihu* (Sk. *pasu*, *pecu*), *ai* is *a* shortened to *i*, and broken before *h* to *ai*; in Gothic *vait* (Sk. *veda*, *oīda*), *ai* is radical *i* strengthened to *ai*. In Gothic *dahtar* (Sk. *duhitar*, *θυγάτηρ*), *au* is radical *u* broken to *au*; in *aúhna*, oven (Sk. *asna*, *ἰπνó* = *ικνο* = *ἄκνο*), the *au* is *a*, darkened to *u*, and broken to *au*; while in Gothic *báug* (*πέφθορα*), *áu* is original *u* strengthened to *áu*. When we hear *ê* and *ô* in Gothic, we see *â*, just as we see Doric *ā* behind Ionic *η*. When we hear *c* in *canis*, we see Sanskrit *s*; when we hear *c* in *cruor*, we see Sanskrit *h*. When we hear *γ* in *γένος*, we see Aryan *g*; when we hear *γ* in *φλέγω*, we see Aryan *z*.

These few illustrations will explain, I hope, the essential difference in the application of phonetics to philology and dialectology, and will show that in the former our brush must of necessity be broad, while in the latter it must be fine. It is by mixing up two separate lines of research, each highly important in itself, that so much confusion has of late been occasioned. The value of purely phonetic observations should on no account be underrated; but it is necessary, for that very reason, that dialectical as well as philological phonetics should each be confined to their proper sphere. The philologist has much to learn from the phonetician, but he should never forget that here, as elsewhere, what is broad and typical is as important and as scientifically accurate as what is minute and special.

What is broad and typical is often more accurate even than what is minute and special. It might be possible, for instance, by a photographic process, to represent the exact position of the tongue and the inside walls of the mouth while we pronounce the Italian vowel *i*. But it would be the greatest mistake to suppose that this image gives us the only way in which that vowel is, and can be pronounced. Though each individual may have his own way of placing the tongue in pronouncing *i*, we have only to try the experiment in order to convince ourselves that, with some effort, we may vary that position in many ways and yet produce the sound of *i*. When, therefore, in my Lectures on the Science of Language, I gave pictures of the positions of the vocal organs required for pronouncing the typical letters of the alphabet, I took great care to make them typical, *i.e.* to leave them rough sketches rather than minute photographs. I cannot better express what I feel on this point than by quoting the words of Haeckel:

"For didactic purposes, simple schematic figures are far more useful than pictures preserving the greatest faithfulness to nature and carried out with the greatest accuracy." ("Ziele und Wege," p. 37).

To return, after this digression, to Mr. Pitman's alphabet, I repeat that it recommends itself to my mind by what others call its inaccuracy. It shows its real and practical wisdom by not attempting to fix any distinctions which are not absolutely necessary. If, for instance, we take the guttural tenuis, we find that English recognises one *k* only, although its pronunciation varies considerably. It is sometimes pronounced so as to produce almost a sharp crack; sometimes it has a deep, hollow sound; and sometimes a soft, lazy, *mouillé* character. It varies considerably according to the vowels which follow it, as anybody may hear, nay feel, if he pronounces, in succession, *col*, *cool*, *car*, *cat*, *kit*. But as English does not use these different *k*'s for the purpose of distinguishing words or grammatical forms, one broad category only of voiceless guttural checks has to be admitted in writing English. In the Semitic languages the case is different; not only are *kaf* and *hof* different in sound, but this difference is used to distinguish different meanings.

Or if we take the vowel *a* in its original, pure pronunciation, like Italian *a*, we can easily perceive that it has different colours in different counties of England. Yet in writing it may be treated as one, because it has but one and the same grammatical intention, and does not convey a new meaning till it exceeds its widest limits. Good speakers in England pronounce the *a* in *last* like the pure Italian *a*; with others it becomes broad, with others thin. But though it may thus oscillate considerably, it must not encroach on the province of *e*, which would change its meaning to *lest*; nor on the province of *o*, which would change it to *lost*; nor on the province of *u*, which would change it to *lust*.

The difficulty, therefore, which Archbishop Trench has pointed out is really restricted to those cases where the pronunciation of vowels—for it is with vowels chiefly that we are troubled—varies so much as to overstep the broadest limits of one of the recognised categories of sound, and to encroach on another. If we take the word *fast*, which is pronounced very differently even by educated people, there would be no necessity for indicating in writing the different shades of pronunciation which lie between the sound of the short Italian *a* and the long *a* as heard in *father*. But when the *a* in *fast* is pronounced like the *a* in *fat*, then the necessity of a new graphic exponent would arise, and Archbishop Trench would be right in twitting phonetic reformers with sanctioning two spellings for the same word.

I could mention the names of three bishops, one of whom pronounced the vowel in *God* like *gaud*, another like *rod*, a third like *gad*. The last pronunciation would probably be condemned by everybody, but the other two would remain, sanctioned by the highest authority, and therefore retained in phonetic writing.

So far, then, I admit that Archbishop Trench has pointed out a real difficulty inherent in phonetic writing; but what is that one difficulty compared with the difficulties of the present system of English spelling? It would not be honest to try to evade his charge, by saying that there is, but one pronunciation recognised by the usage of educated people. That is not so, and those who know best the biology of language, know that it cannot be so. The very life of language consists in a constant friction between the centripetal force of custom and the centrifugal force of individual freedom. Against that difficulty therefore there is no remedy. Only here again the Archbishop seems to have overlooked the fact that the difficulty belongs to the present system of spelling nearly as much as to the phonetic system. There is but one recognised way of spelling, but everybody pronounces according to his own idiosyncrasies. It would be the same with phonetic spelling. One pronunciation, the best recognised, would have to be adopted as a standard in phonetic writing, leaving to every Englishman his freedom to pronounce as seemeth good to him. We should lose nothing of what we now possess, and all the advantages of phonetic writing would remain unimpaired. The real state of the case is, therefore, this—No one defends the present system of spelling; every one admits the serious injury which it inflicts on national education. Everybody admits the practical advantages of phonetic spelling, but after that, all exclaim that a reform of spelling, whether partial or complete, is impossible. Whether it is impossible or not, I gladly leave to men of the world to decide. As a scholar, as a student of the history of language, I simply maintain that in every written language a reform of spelling is, sooner or later, inevitable. No doubt the evil day may be put off. I have little doubt that it will be put off for many generations, and that a real reform will probably not be carried except concurrently with a violent social convulsion. Only let the question be argued fairly. Let facts have some weight, and let it not be supposed by men of the world that those who defend the principles of the *Phonetic Nuz* are only teetotalers and vegetarians, who have never learned how to spell.

If I have spoken strongly in support of Mr. Pitman's system, it is not because on all points I consider it superior to the systems prepared by other reformers, particularly by Messrs. Ellis and Jones, who have devised schemes of phonetic spelling that dispense with any new types; but chiefly because it has been tested so largely, and has stood the test well. Mr. Pitman's *Phonetic Journal* has now been published thirty-four years, and if it is known that it is published weekly in 9,250 copies, each copy representing at least four or five readers, it may not seem so very foolish, after all, if we imagine that there is some vital power in that insignificant germ.

F. MAX MÜLLER.

SOME TRUTHS ABOUT EGYPT.

THAT Englishmen are as a rule blind, stone-blind, as to the condition of the Turkish empire, there can be no manner of doubt. For long it has been impossible to use any portion of the English daily press to lift the veil of darkness which has hidden the rottenness and the iniquities of the Government of the Sultan and his feudatories. It has been the interest of an influential portion of the monied classes to conceal the symptoms of the sick man's disease and decay, and they have accordingly been carefully and effectually hidden. Writers whose letters on other subjects have meanwhile been freely and constantly inserted in the daily papers, both Liberal and Conservative, and who have tried to set the truth about Turkey before their countrymen, have been over and over again disappointed, and have tried in vain. Consular authorities and diplomatic agents in the East have, it is loudly whispered, received instructions or hints from the Foreign Office to report nothing which will appear in print in a Blue-Book contrary to the interests of the Turkish empire. "It is part of my official religion," said a candid English consular official of an Oriental town, "to love the Turks and to hate the Greeks, but after years spent in Turkey I find myself obliged to act in a precisely contrary manner."

It is not, however, the object of the present paper to expose the enormities and the cruelties of misrule in Turkey proper, but to direct attention to Egypt, and to attempt to disabuse the mind of the English public of certain utterly erroneous ideas which are commonly entertained with respect to that country, in which, through the purchase of the Suez Canal shares, they have now a direct interest, and consequently a direct responsibility. The English press, since the Turkish bubble has begun to burst, has lately talked much of the independence of Egypt. Now what does the independence of Egypt really mean? For when evils are inveterate in a system, the withdrawal of restraints, however small, can but make those evils more inveterate still. It means

1. The continuance of slavery.
 2. The continuance of forced labour, with its attendant hardships and cruelties.
 3. A brutal conscription.
 4. Wholesale confiscation of land and other property.
 5. Grinding taxation, to support the unbounded luxury and caprices of an irresponsible Turkish and consequently alien tyrant.
1. It is commonly believed in England that the Khedive is

opposed to slavery. The man has so often said so to the Prince of Wales, and to other noble guests, that the mass of Englishmen have come to believe him. Nothing, however, can be more absolutely contrary to the truth. The real fact is that the Khedive is the largest slave-owner in Egypt. There is not one of the almost numberless palaces of his Highness, and his sons and pashas, which is not full to overflowing of slaves of both sexes, and they are to be found in private houses throughout the whole length of the land of Egypt. The Khedive himself continually buys them; and in addition to his domestic slaves, his Highness, as he increases his stock of women, increases also his stock of those unhappy beings who are specially mutilated, and that under circumstances of the most revolting barbarity, in order to preserve the fidelity of his concubines and wives, which he finds he cannot secure by expensive presents of French jewellery. Let it be especially noted that,—to put Georgians and other whites, who are supplied through the Turkish market, out of the question,—African slaves can only be brought into Egypt by way of Suez or by the Nile, and that one single word from the Viceroy could stop the importation of a single slave into Egypt, or arrest their progress at any point on their way to Cairo. That word, however, has never been spoken. Slaves are seen daily descending the Nile in open day. I have repeatedly seen them myself when ascending and descending the Nile in a dahabeeah. I have seen slaves chained together with iron chains; and on one occasion a slave heavily loaded with irons attempted to end his miseries by throwing himself into the Nile before my own Nile-boat. Only last year I witnessed the sale of a young female slave by a Government official at Assouan, who made £5 by the transaction, and who pulled out her tongue, showed her teeth, and indicated the good points of the poor little shrinking creature with all the zest of an experienced dealer. This year I travelled in the train from Suez with an Egyptian soldier who had with him a little Christian slave-boy whom he had kidnapped from Abyssinia, while Christian England is looking on with abject admiration at the spectacle of the only Christian country in Africa being subjugated by her Mohammedan ally. It is true that open slave-markets are abolished, but I could buy a slave myself to-morrow, if only I did it *sub rosa*, for fear of the European consuls. In saying thus much, I do not wish it to be understood that I believe that slaves in Egypt are on the whole ill-treated. On the contrary, I think that when once bought they are well used, like other valuable property, but they are undoubtedly treated with great cruelty by the slavers who bring them from the interior; and a relic which was shown me in the British Consulate at Tarabulus Gharb (Tripoli in Barbary) shows to what lengths a Turkish pasha is capable of going with his

chattel. This relic is a massive collar of iron, spiked like that of a mastiff, and so contrived that the wretch upon whose neck it was welded could not move his head without being impaled. This ornament was filed off the neck of a slave who had escaped from the palace of the Pasha.

The attitude of England towards both Turkey and Egypt in the matter of slavery must be the subject of continual amazement to every unprejudiced observer. But it shows the power of the almighty dollar. Englishmen commonly believe that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, but they stop the application of this wholesome if homely maxim when they come to deal with those Mohammedan tyrants with whose well-being the pecuniary interests of a part of the English people are supposed to be bound up. Slavery in Zanzibar or Cuba is an abomination to be abhorred by Christian England, but slavery in Turkey or Egypt is a thing to be—well, winked at and condoned, while at the same time Christian English money is to be lavished and lent to any extent in order to bolster up the very two powers which are the greatest supporters of slavery in the world! Englishmen, again, seem to take pride in the not altogether bloodless exploits of distinguished filibusters like Baker and others, but the knowing ones of Egypt see in those costly expeditions only the intention of the Khedive to open up new fields for the procuring of slaves and slave labour. Certainly, as appears from Sir S. Baker's own admissions, his Egyptian Highness has given a handle to such an opinion by attaching to Sir Samuel's retinue a ruffian who was a notorious slave-driver, and by refusing, spite of his own plighted word, to punish that same person when sent back to Cairo in disgrace.

2. *The Independence of Egypt means the Continuance of Forced Labour.*—It is astonishing that the majority of Englishmen should imagine that a stop has been put to this infamous system, when the very reverse is the case. The Egyptian Fellaheen and the poor generally are liable to forced labour—first, at the public works—a term of very elastic meaning in a country where all things exist for the ruling despot—such as railways, the repair of dykes, the making of canals, the construction of bridges; and secondly, on the estates and at the sugar manufactories of the Khedive. For the first of these the people receive no payment, and keep themselves; for the second they keep themselves for fifty days, and afterwards occasionally receive a few dry, gritty rusk a day, and a small nominal payment, which, however, in many instances, and especially in remote places, is either altogether withheld or paid only in part. I have the word of the European superintendent of one of the largest of the Khedive's sugar-works that no payment has been made during his term of office, a period of several years, to any of the people

employed. What takes place is this: Some hundreds of hands are wanted at one of the Khedive's estates or works. An order is issued. A steamer with soldiers on board is sent up the Nile, towing several huge barges of iron or wood. It anchors opposite a town or village, and soon hundreds of men, boys, and girls, many of tender age, are seen hurrying and being driven down to the river-bank, clutching such small bags of bread or fragments of rusk as they can collect in haste, and accompanied by their parents, friends, wives, and children, who rend the air with their shrill screams and lamentations, for they well know that many a dear face will never be seen again. Neither the only sons of widows or of blind and aged parents, nor the fathers of helpless infants are spared. The despot requires them—the bastinado and the prison are the cost of refusal. The whole crowd are rapidly swept into the barges, where, without regard to age or sex, they are packed together like herrings in a barrel. The steamer and the barges then start with their living freight, many of whom will never return to their homes from the distant sugar or cotton estate to which they are conveyed. During the process of their being driven on board and during the voyage no more account is taken of the occupants of the barges than of brute beasts. Arrived at the scene of their labours, an incessant mill-horse grind of toil ensues. There is no Friday rest, no moment's space allowed for recreation. Both sexes labour under the eye of taskmasters armed with sticks, whips, konobashes, which are freely and needlessly applied to the often naked and at all events only one-shirted backs of those poor "free" labourers, whom the charity of England has not yet learned to pity, and whose brutal taskmaster-in-chief she has not yet learned to condemn. I have myself seen little, tender, emaciated girls staggering under heavy loads of earth, who have been lashed each time they ascended the high bank at which they were at work, and even prodded in the naked breasts with sharp palm-sticks. I have seen them sinking upon the earth, fainting under their loads. No sort of shelter is provided for these unfortunates, though the nights of an Egyptian winter can be very cold, and a single shirt is their only garment. Many have not even this. On the filthy floor of the sugar factory, or on the bare stubbly ground of the cane-field—where they cease working, there they lie down to take their scanty rest, and are succeeded on the instant by other gangs awakened to relieve them. Thus, night and day, without intermission, the work goes on, and the cringing parasites of the little Egyptian Court, and the base crew of servile European speculators who prey upon the Khedive, and the Consuls-General who love to speak smooth things, and Cook's tourists, and the reporters of the English "dailies," lift up their hands in fulsome admiration, and proclaim to the world that so many more pounds of sugar have been produced in Egypt in *this* than in the

previous years. These people forget to proclaim also how much blood—and that human blood—has been expended in its refinement and elaboration! An English friend visiting one of the Khedive's sugar factories a few days ago, observed a man at work loaded with immense iron chains. On inquiring the reason, he was informed that the poor wretch had been detected sucking a few inches of sugar-cane, and was accordingly condemned to work in chains for five days and nights, without sleep, and without being allowed to stop to eat.

One word more upon this head only. In speaking of public works it should be remembered that under this term are included railways which are the exclusive, private property of the Viceroy, and intended only for the conveyance of produce from his estates, and to whose trains a few battered carriages only are attached for passengers to whom time is no object; and canals to the Vice-regal estates, into whose sacred waters no common man's shadow is allowed to dip.

3. *The Independence of Egypt implies a brutal and wholesale Conscription.*—In some European countries, where an universal liability to serve in the army exists—and I am very far from asserting that such a liability is indefensible and, on the whole, inexpedient—the conscripted are, at all events, called on to defend their country, their wives, their families, and their homes. In Egypt, on the contrary, this dreadful peculiarity exists, that the poor Arab conscripts are compelled to execute the sole will of a capricious tyrant of an alien and inferior race, and to rival the cruelties of the Hebrew taskmasters of old, by harrying and exacting money from their own countrymen. In no country is ancient tragedy so often re-enacted as in Egypt! At the present time, while the war mania prevails in the Viceroy's mind, and men are needed to enable him to gratify the passions of religious hate and vain ostentation by foreign conquest, the conscription is being carried on in the most oppressive and arbitrary manner possible. In Cairo, even, respectable young men, of whom many are husbands and fathers of families, are arrested by the soldiery and police in the public streets and cafés, thrown into prison upon false and trumped-up charges, and if money is not forthcoming for their release, pressed into the army. In the villages men are simply seized by force, chained or welded together in wooden stocks—a brutal practice, of which I have seen examples within the last few days—and dragged to the nearest barracks, to be dealt with by low Turkish officers and American generals from the United States, who have followed the base example of Hobart Pasha in selling their swords to work the will of a despot. At this time the country villages and towns everywhere resound with the cries of women whose husbands and sons have been torn from them by force.

4. *The Independence of Egypt means the perpetuation of the system*

of the confiscation of land and property to the Khedive's use.—When Ahab sets his heart on Naboth's vineyard, or rather, when the Viceroy sets his heart upon a tract of land for a sugar plantation or cotton estate, the occupants—they can scarcely be called *owners* when they have to pay on the average £2 a year per ferdân in gold to Effendeena—the occupants are compelled to sell their land at a valuation in which they are themselves passive instruments and without a voice. The sum, generally £6 per ferdân, which is fixed on is, however, generally paid. This small sum, however, is soon spent, and the Fellaheen are thus completely swept away to take refuge and gain a living how and where they may, and are forced to part with their camels, oxen, goats, sheep, and donkeys for what they will fetch at the time. Thus, instead of the beautiful agriculture, and varied crops of wheat, barley, dhourrah, clover, beans, vetches, and flax, which delight the eye, and make the rich land of Egypt seem even as the Garden of the Lord, and which, in addition, afford food for an industrious, peaceable, and honest population and their beautiful cattle, nothing is seen but vast expanses of a single crop—sugar or cotton—and that the property of *one* man, who thus enriches himself at the expense and to the ruin of his own subjects. There is another and still baser form of confiscation. When His Highness wants camels or donkeys for any of his speculations, an order is issued to the Sheyks el Belad, and the country people, including sometimes the nearest Bedoucen of the desert, are compelled to bring their animals, often very long distances, to some appointed place, where they are seized, valued by an inspector appointed by the Governor, and paid for, or *not* paid for, as the case may be. Agriculture is thus thrown back, and families ruined. From some parts of the country all the strongest and best donkeys have been carried off, and the breed permanently deteriorated. Lately, in the rich Province of Baheyra, vast numbers of camels have been seized at Damânhour, and an English eye-witness of the fact assures me that not one was paid for, the poor owners not being even allowed anything for their expenses on the way. These camels were simply confiscated in the name of Effendeena, and their owners driven away penniless. This account was afterwards confirmed by a native official. Donkeys and other animals are seized and confiscated in a similar manner. The accidental discovery of antiquities exposes the unlucky finder not only to the loss of the treasure trove, but to a severe flogging, and at times to imprisonment. The effect of this atrocious system is that a fine work of ancient art is generally broken up and sold piecemeal to the first comer, while objects of gold and silver at once find their way to the melting pot. The Turk is not only cruel and unjust, but excessively stupid.

5. *The Independence of Egypt signifies the Continuance of a Most Oppressive and Grinding System of Taxation which has a Show of Legality, and to Continual Exactions which have None.*—Up to the present time, when an annual tribute has to be paid by the Viceroy to the Sultan, it is clearly the interest of the latter to use what influence he possesses to prevent the over-taxation of the people. It is true that this influence has not been used as it ought, but it *might* be, and the fear of such a restraining power can scarcely fail to have had its effect on the Khedive. Make the Viceroy independent, and that slight safeguard is taken away. The real wonder is that the Egyptian Fellah can exist at all. For the land he occupies, and which was conquered for him by his Arabian forefathers, he has, as we have said, to pay to the Khedive on the average £2 per ferdân in gold. Every house is taxed, every palm-tree is taxed; in Cairo every donkey, and in the country every camel, ox, horse, and sheep. Besides this, under French tutelage octroi duties have been established in Cairo and other large towns, and the poor Cairene donkey-boys are forced to pay a tax upon every mouthful of clover consumed by their donkeys. A year or two ago there was a tax on donkey-boys, duty had to be paid on the one blue robe worn by the Fellaheen, and taxgatherers were stationed at the ferries and other public thoroughfares to arrest those whose scarfs did not bear the yellow Government brand. It can scarcely compensate the ground-down Fellah to know that the money thus wrung from him goes to enable his lord and master to add palace to palace, to support a disproportionate army for purposes of foreign aggression, and to add to his stock of eunuchs, third-rate French actresses, and Yankee generals.¹ Some years ago the land-tribute was demanded for several years in advance on the promise that the payers should be exempted in future, but this promise, it is almost needless to add, was never kept.² The fact is, the Khedive is much in the position of the fool who killed the goose that laid the golden eggs. The Fellaheen have been taxed more than they can bear, and though at the present time flogging is often resorted to in order to extort money, more money cannot be had. Meanwhile the poverty and misery of the people is extreme, although their sufferings are borne with marvellous resignation. A greater instance of God's goodness can scarcely be imagined than the cheerful, contented disposition with which he has endowed the down-trodden people of Egypt, who will repay the smallest act of justice and even a kind word or look with a grateful affection which is truly pathetic

(1) An official estimated the number of the Khedive's wives, concubines, slaves, and other female attendants as amounting to 900 women! I am assured that this estimate is below rather than above the mark.

(2) Instances occurred of people offering their property to any one who would undertake to pay the taxes, and failing in this the land was snapped up by eunuchs and women of the harem. The bastinado was freely applied to exact this forced tax.

It is not, however, the poor alone who suffer from the extravagance and the dishonesty of their lord. A compulsory tax has been established upon the salaries of all Government officials, who are compelled to contribute one day's pay in each month, which sum is deducted from the sum owed them. In addition to this, salaries are paid with the utmost irregularity, officials receiving their pay months and even more than a year after it is due. The tendency of this, of course, is to induce them to exact money from those beneath them. The condition of the lower grades especially of those officials is much to be pitied, for they have a position to maintain, and to many of them an official dress is prescribed.

There are some, and these chiefly of the Cook's Tourist sort, who "do" Cairo in three days and the Nile in twenty, and of that class of servile Alexandrian traders who would scream with delight if the Khedive were to tumble for coppers in the Frank Square, who are for ever talking about the "progress" of Egypt. I wish I could think that there was progress. Change, indeed, there has been, but I doubt the progress. The question is not whether Cairo, or Alexandria, or Egypt has been Europeanized, and made more agreeable for the ordinary run of tourists, but whether the changes made really conduce to the well-being, happiness, and profit of the native inhabitants of the country. This may well admit of doubt, although it is hard to get an Englishman to believe that English institutions and customs are not the best possible for all the peoples upon earth, just as, in his sublime self-conceit, he is always wanting to thrust the Thirty-nine Articles down the throats of Christians of all the ancient Churches of Christendom. But let us see what the changes in Egypt amount to. The Khedive, then, has discarded the flowing Eastern dress, and waddles about in French broadcloth and varnished boots, and when he goes out, instead of riding a horse, like a man, he lolls in a luxurious French carriage. In Alexandria, it is true, some of the streets have been paved, but this has been done at the expense of Frank and Levantine merchants, and in spite of the Government rather than by its aid. In Cairo things are different. There the changes have been made by Effendeena himself. And what have we there? Instead of the wild, tangled garden of the once picturesque Esbeykeyeh, with its fine forest trees, and undergrowth of santon and roses, open to all the world, there is half the space sold to speculators for the erections of cafés and gambling hells, and the other half inclosed within a cast-iron French railing of monotonous design, and a parky, newly-planted garden within it, with a puddle with a punt and two swans in the centre, a Swiss chalet at each of the four gates, a vista ending in the chimney of some waterworks, a bit of rock-work, several grog-shops, and a kiosk where a band plays airs from "Madame Angot" in the afternoons.

For entrance to this paradise, (which, after all, is as pleasant as an English suburban tea-garden), His Highness charges the public a piastre a head. Then there is the new hotel (the Khedive's own), which would be an eyesore at Bognor or Harrogate; the Duke of Sutherland's new house, which resembles an aggregation of packing-boxes; and an English church which would be a disgrace to Mr. Compo. In place of the old, narrow streets—purposely narrow on account of the heat of the climate, but always cool and dry—there are new blazing thoroughfares, which are either blinding from dust and heat, or bathed with water to such an extent that the donkeys cannot keep their footing. It is certain that the climate of Cairo has been changed for the worse by the perpetual watering of the new streets and garden. A thick mist frequently hangs over that portion of the town where formerly the air was dry and healthy. To provide space for these new streets and squares, there has been a wholesale confiscation of private house property, and the wanton destruction of several splendid ancient mosques. Again, while the mosque of Sultan Hassan—the Westminster Abbey of Cairo, and perhaps the finest specimen of Arab architecture extant—is allowed to go to rack and ruin, the Khedive is erecting at vast expense a tasteless pile by its side. The citadel, with its unrivalled view—once the residence of the old Arab Caliphs—has been modernized, spoiled, and abandoned; while the Viceroy lives in the frightful palaces of Abdiu and Gezeesch, and flings away his people's money in the continual erection of uglier palaces still. One of the finest of the mosque-tombs of the Memlook Sultans is, moreover, used as a magazine of gunpowder. In fact, in less than twenty years at the present rate of destruction, not a single fine ancient building will be left in Cairo, once, but soon no longer to be the queen of Oriental cities.

Much has been said and written about the progress of education in Egypt, but, so far as the country poor are concerned, very little has been done. A short time since, a late distinguished consular official was appointed Director of Education in Egypt, and though many who admired his talents the most, wondered that he should condescend to accept a post under such a master, they at least hoped that there would be a marked progress in education. Scarcely, however, had this gentleman arrived at his post when he was sent back to England with a large salary, to push the Khedive's interests in England!

Again, the railway system of Egypt, although the mileage has been largely increased, has, so far as passenger traffic is concerned, decidedly gone back in efficiency, and nothing can be worse than the management and arrangements generally. There are but two good trains in all Egypt—the morning express from Cairo to

Alexandria, and *vice versa*, and those are due to the pressure of the mercantile body in Alexandria.

The real fact appears to be that it is useless to hope for improvement in Egypt so long as it is governed by a Turk. It seems probable that it is impossible to improve a Turk by bringing him in contact with European civilization. You may make him worse, but you cannot make him better. The old-fashioned, bigoted Turk of Central Asia Minor, whom I have *not* seen, has, I do not doubt, many fine qualities. He is a "gentleman," he speaks the truth, his hospitality is unbounded, he believes in God, he says his prayers. But the civilized Turk, whom I *have* seen—a Turk, *i.e.*, of the stuff of which Sultans and Pashas are made—is quite a different being. He is bigoted without being religious; he is tyrannical, superstitious, cruel, luxurious. He is an accomplished liar, and his so-called civilization consists in his wearing French polished leather boots, drinking brandy and champagne, and importing a worn-out French actress. He is, in short, a whitened sepulchre, not over and above fair without, but very foul indeed within. He is covered with French broadcloth, but scratch him and you see the low Tartar at once. From such a man a country can have no hope, and the more independent he is the worse he will be.

I pause a moment here to remark that one thing may fairly be said in favour of Egypt. The Christians in that country are far better treated than they are in Turkey. The massacres and martyrdoms of the Greek Islands and of the Lebanon have no counterpart on the banks of the Nile. This, perhaps, is not so much from the better feeling of the rulers as from the circumstance that the country is itself so narrow, and that the European Consuls are so numerous and so powerful. Indications, however, are not wanting that the will to injure is not absent. Recently the Khedive has forcibly closed the school of the U. S. A. Presbyterian schools at Koos, and Coptic Christians are now pressed into the army along with the rest of the population. It is alleged that great obstacles are placed in the way of the soldiers attending divine worship, but I have certainly seen many of them at the Aced-el-Ghitas on the eve of the Epiphany and at other festivals in the Metropolitan Church in Cairo. During the vacancy caused by the death of the late Coptic patriarch, the Khedive, there is no doubt, placed great obstacles in the way of the election of his successor, but this was probably the result rather of a curious superstition than of religious bigotry.

And now, if it would seem that the independence of the ruler of Egypt would but aggravate and intensify present evils, is there no remedy for the state of things depicted in the foregoing pages?—a state which has indeed been painted in too faint instead of in too dark colours. When there is a uniform dead-level of continual cruelty,

rapacity, and injustice, it is hard to select particular instances, and those already advanced do but exemplify the common, every-day state of affairs. For myself I cannot agree with the sentiment of Mr. Freeman—and it is the only one in his article in this Review (Dec. 1875) to which I cannot heartily subscribe—when he says that he cannot quarrel with Moslem tyrants in respect of this treatment of their Mohammedan subjects. Surely we need not so limit our sympathies, but should be ready when occasion offers to help all. And assuredly a great cry for justice rises up before Heaven from Egypt. Might not we Englishmen hope that by unseating the present alien despot and by occupying at least a portion of Egypt, we could give to the Arab inhabitants that meed of justice, which spite of the individual shortcomings of new-fledged Scotch civilians and English subalterns we have in the main given to India? In that occupation lies, I am persuaded, the sole hope of Egypt. As a rule I am opposed to further annexations of territory. I believe that empires, like Russia and the United States, may be too large for the happiness and liberty of the people, but in respect to Egypt I am convinced that the occupation of the country, so far at least as the Delta, Cairo, and some portion of the higher Nile valley is concerned, is imposed upon us both by political necessity and by duty. By political necessity; because now that Englishmen have begun to find out that the Bosphorus is not on the direct road to India, and now that the Sick Man's constitution seems to be finally breaking up, it becomes of paramount importance to British interests to possess the true approach to our Indian possessions and to have the command of the great highway in which we have just acquired so large an interest. And next, by duty; because we should then break the chains of slavery and open the doors of the house of bondage, and give freedom, justice, and protection to an honest and faithful people who are now groaning under a foreign yoke. The most zealous sticklers for the doctrine that possession and prescription sanctify tyranny and usurpation are unable to pretend that the family of Mohammed Ali have any right to the Arabian country which they misrule.

GREVILLE J. CHESTER.

ON MR. MILL'S THEORY OF VALUE.

It has often been noted that what a man writes in condemnation of the opinions of another is open to all the sources of error that affect his work when he expounds his own opinions, and to others in addition: for he may have failed rightly to track the thoughts which he believes himself to be criticising. When a truth assumes great importance for a man and he sees it clearly, he will make others see it clearly; he will be trustworthy so long as he writes of it constructively. But, though he may be wholly superior to the temptation so to lower the reputation of previous writers that his own may be the more eminent, his devotion to the truth which is dominant in his own mind will be apt not only to render him jealous of the position of complementary truths, but so far to pre-occupy his thoughts as to hinder him from perceiving all that these truths have worked in the minds of others. It is not, therefore, an unhealthy sign of the times that a series of attacks has been made by various writers on various sides of the central doctrine of the book by which most living English economists have been educated; and it is not a matter of wonder that some of these attacks have been made by thinkers of great power. It may be possible without detracting from the worth of what they have contributed towards the construction of the theory of Value, to show that many of their destructive criticisms are due to their not having perceived the full power, which is latent, if not patent, in Mill's work. If this can be effected, some energy which is now consumed in quarrels in the economists' camp, may be turned to use in the common cause, and do good service against error. The aim of the present article is to indicate in outline Mill's position, so as to display its strength. I shall refer in footnotes to some criticisms on Mill contained in a work by Professor Cairnes.¹ His already well-earned reputation, the soundness of his judgment, the lucidity and grace of his style, the tact and skill with which he has brought out clearly defined results, have combined to render that work extremely popular. Although Cairnes may be regarded as one of Mill's most distinguished disciples, yet a considerable portion of his book is devoted to a new exposition of some principles which he apparently thought had not been adequately appreciated or stated with sufficient accuracy by Mill. These points of difference between the two writers have been seized upon with avidity by an influential set of men, who, by the recent publication of Mill's Autobiography, had been put

(1) "Some leading Principles of Political Economy."

in a mood to regard Mill as a slighter man than they had thought him before. I believe that in most instances in which Mill's doctrines have been criticised by Cairnes, and by other writers, Mill is substantially right. I also think that Cairnes considered that the difference between himself and Mill is greater than it really is. The better class of readers used to puzzle over a difficult passage of Mill's till they got to see, more or less, its whole drift. Now such readers readily adopt Cairnes' authoritative suggestion, that it contains a blunder: they see distinctly that half of the truth which Cairnes has written out for them in a bold, clear hand; they do not trouble themselves to hunt out that more recondite half, to which Mill was, as it seems to me, working his way, but with which Cairnes has not concerned himself. There is no doubt that Cairnes was a genuinely sincere friend of Mill and truth. I am grateful for the services he has rendered to Economics: I cannot express that gratitude better than by unflinchingly pointing out cases in which he seems to me not to have got hold of the whole of Mill's meaning.

A critic of Mill's writings may not ignore the following facts. In the small leisure that was left to him free from official work, Mill wrote on a wide variety of questions, which had already been discussed by great thinkers. On almost every one of these questions his thoughts, whatever faults they contained, were in some respect new. Therefore he had not much time for elaborating the explanation of his thoughts. His style was that of a man having great power of exposition; but in one respect this power injured him. For it caused men to assume that whatever error appeared in his writings was due not to imperfect presentation of clear thought, but to perfect presentation of confused thought. They have overlooked the fact that this power could not avail him for the task of drilling a large body of thoughts into such order that they should in all their movements present a clear front to the reader. For this task time alone avails.

In writing his Political Economy he laboured under special disadvantages. He wished to compress into it a vast amount of matter; but his style is so easeful as to incite his readers to overmuch rapidity. Hence it occurs that he is frequently charged not only with omitting truths of which he has taken account, but even with holding erroneous doctrines which he has in due place demolished, and thereafter ignored. He did not even consider himself at liberty to select his terms freely: he feared to weight the science, which was not then popular, with the burden of technical terms. Moreover he was finely jealous for his predecessors: he gave not only to Ricardo, but, in opposition to the current of the time, to Adam Smith whatever credit he could. Nearly all of those phrases of his

which are unfortunate, are phrases of theirs which he has been unwilling to discard. Thus he has been induced to retain the use of some expressions which he has affirmed to be neither sufficiently flexible nor sufficiently firm for the proper purposes of science.

Those, then, who wish rightly to construe any of Mill's economic doctrines, must learn the special part which he intended that doctrine to perform, to the end that they may not demand from it the discharge of functions which he has assigned to some other portion of his system; and they must remember that he is not always careful to repeat an indication that he has once given of the special application which he intends to make of a word or a phrase in a particular discussion. They must, therefore, consider each passage in connection with its context; and when its interpretation cannot by this means be conclusively settled, they must with generous caution reject any rendering of it which is inconsistent with the general purport of his writings. Readers who will observe these rules may find in Mill's economic doctrines much exposition that requires to be supplemented, and many abrupt lines of thought which require to be continued. But they will find that it is true of his thought, as of Adam Smith's, that much even of the work which most invites the attack of the destructive critic is, in the main, sound as far as it goes. This is, as it appears to me, the case with his account of value.

It was known, even before the publication of his Autobiography, that Mill regarded, as perhaps the chief of the services which he had rendered to economics, his work in breaking up and re-arranging its chief problems; and, though experience may have shown that in some details his arrangement is not wholly successful, we are bound to take account of the important truth which the general plan of his arrangement embodies.

This plan was, in separate books, firstly to treat the nature of human efforts, and the laws of the production of wealth generally; secondly, the distribution of wealth; and thirdly, to devote a book exclusively to "the machinery of exchange." His first book is mainly concerned with the causes which affect generally the efficiency of labour in production. The analysis contained here enables him, when he treats of exchange value, to dismiss this aspect of cost of production with a reference to his first book; and the curt statement, "What the production of a thing costs to its producers, or its series of producers, is the labour expended in producing it."¹ In his second book he develops Adam Smith's grand doctrine, which shows how the distribution of wealth would be effected "naturally," i.e. as the average result of free competition operating through many

(1) Bk. III., Ch. IV., § 1. Attention may be directed to the extensions of this analysis in Hearn's "Plutology," and in Jevons' "Theory of Political Economy."

generations. This distribution would be such that the wages which a man receives would vary, according to certain laws, with the efforts and sacrifices demanded from him, conjointly with the efforts and sacrifices which his special education demanded from his parents and others; and that thus the remuneration of each task would in a manner measure the efforts it had cost to society as a whole, or rather to those members of society who, directly or indirectly, had contributed to its performance. Mill explains the artificial hindrances to this correspondence between the remuneration of various tasks and their total effort-costs. He shows how these hindrances are due not only to formal trade regulations, but also to the special difficulties against which parents in the various grades of society have to contend, if they desire to secure high wages to their sons in the future, at the expense of a present sacrifice to themselves. He points out that, roughly speaking, English labour falls into four "different grades," between which "the line of demarcation has hitherto been so strongly marked as to be almost equivalent to a hereditary distinction of caste; each employment being chiefly recruited from the children of those already employed in it, or of employments of the same rank with it in social estimation, or from the children of persons who, if originally of a lower rank, have succeeded in raising themselves by their exertions."¹ These four grades are:—i. the liberal professions; ii. the more highly-skilled manual employments; iii. the lower classes of skilled employments; iv. unskilled labourers. Labourers of the second grade are partly supplied from "the class of tradesmen who rank with them;" so are those of the third. "The wages of each class have been hitherto regulated by the increase of its own population." But "the general relaxation of conventional barriers, and the increased facilities which already are, and will be in a much greater degree, brought within the reach of all, tend to produce, among many excellent effects, one which is the reverse: they tend to bring down the wages of skilled labour." Mill is so far from ignoring "conventional barriers," that he regards it as his special task to insist that the "arrangements" which were due to them be distinguished from the "natural laws" of political economy; and enforces this distinction by the arrangement of his work. In a similar strain he continues Adam Smith's account of profits.² And after indicating how the ele-

(1) Bk. II., Ch. XIV. Cairnes has done good service by insisting on this fact. Mill's account is complete, but too terse. Few persons have any more notion than Cairnes had that his far-famed account of the four grades of labour had been anticipated not only in outline, but in detail by Mill.

(2) The drift of part of his argument on this point might be made clearer by building in some material from the fourth of his important, but neglected, "Essays on Unsettled Questions of Political Economy." Though it is a digression, I may venture to remark that his treatment of the influence which the distribution of wealth exerts on the accumulation of capital is one of the weakest portions of his

ment of rent may in general be eliminated from the problems of the third book, he concludes the second book with the statement that the discussion of the subject with which it deals will be taken up again in the fourth book, and that he will interpolate "a separate book" devoted to "the instrumentality by which, in a civilised society, the distribution is effected—the machinery of exchange and price." This statement is repeated and dwelt upon in the introduction to his third book, and it appears to me to be sufficiently emphatic; but additional emphasis has recently been given to it, in so far at least as it refers to the special functions of the second book, by the account of the tone of his treatise on political economy, which occurs in his Autobiography. He there speaks of—

"That general tone by which it is distinguished from all previous expositions of political economy that had any pretension to be scientific, and which made it so useful in conciliating minds which those previous expositions had repelled. This tone consisted chiefly in making the proper distinction between the laws of the production of wealth, which are real laws of nature, dependent on the properties of objects, and the modes of its distribution, which, subject to certain conditions, depend on human will. The common run of political economists confuse these together, under the designation of economic laws, which they deem incapable of being defeated or modified by human effort; ascribing the same necessity to things dependent on the unchangeable conditions of our earthly existence, and to those which, being but the necessary consequences of particular social arrangements, are merely co-extensive with these: given certain institutions and customs, wages, profits, and rent will be determined by certain causes; but this class of political economists drop the indispensable presupposition, and argue that these causes must, by an inherent necessity, against which no human means can avail, determine the shares which fall in the division of the produce to labourers, capitalists, and landlords. The 'Principles of Political Economy' yielded to none of its predecessors in aiming at the scientific appreciation of the action of these causes under the conditions which they presuppose; but it set the example of not regarding those conditions as final. The economic generalizations which depend, not on necessities of nature, but on those combined with the existing arrangements of

system, even if account be taken of his essay (*Fortnightly Review*, vol. v., N.S., p. 515) to introduce into his old theory of the wages-fund, "the qualifications and limitations necessary to make it admissible." Scant justice has been done to the arguments by which Mill supports the position that, partly on account of its being badly formulated, this doctrine gave countenance to the notion that the distribution of the produce of industry between capitalists and wage-receivers is governed by a "natural" and "immutable law" and is not capable of being modified by a readjustment of "the arrangements of society." He does not argue that any action such as that of trades unions can suddenly cause a *great* change in these arrangements, or the consequent distribution of wealth; he contends merely that the claims of trades unions to make a change must be discussed freely; they are not to be ruled out of court without a hearing, as condemned by a "natural law." Much work must be done before we even approach a solution of the difficulties which Mill here indicates. Some of his critics, including Professor Cairnes, ignore these difficulties, and quote against him principles which underlie his reasonings throughout his treatise (see not only Bk. II., Chap. xi., but also Bk. I., chs. v., vi., and xi.; Bk. II., ch. xv.; Bk. IV., chs. iv., vi). The simple suggestion has been publicly made that in his later years he may have forgotten these elementary principles.

society, it deals with as only provisional, and as liable to be much altered by the progress of social improvement."¹

Thus (i.) natural laws determine the total stock of the material wealth or material sources of enjoyment, which will at any stage of progress be produced at the total cost of given human efforts and sacrifices: (ii.) the "human will" and "particular social arrangements"² determine the scheme according to which remuneration shall be distributed out of this total sum to each class of efforts and sacrifices: (iii.) this distribution is effected by the instrumentality of a "machinery of exchange," the greater part of which would be put in requisition under almost any social arrangements that are likely to exist in the civilised world. The science of this machinery is the proper province of "pure" or "abstract" economic investigations.

If it be given that a bottle of wine and a pound of tea can be disposed of for the same price in the same open market at a given period, the gratifications of the purchasers in this market at this time due to the bottle of wine and the pound of tea, have this price as their common exchange measure; and the machinery of exchange is not concerned with any other of their properties. If it be given that twenty minutes' work by a physician, or two days' work by a watchmaker, or four days' work by a carpenter, or a fortnight's work by an agricultural labourer, can be bought in a given market at the same time for a guinea, and that the sacrifice involved in the loan of twenty guineas for a year can be bought by a guinea, then these several efforts and this abstinence are equivalent to one another for the purposes of the machinery of exchange working in that market at that time. These data being given, the machinery takes no further account of the pleasures or pains concerned. A chemist's balance takes no account of the medical properties of an ounce of arsenic, but the chemist does. Mill in due place takes account of the fatigue due to the work of the watchmaker and the carpenter; but the machinery treated of in his third book does not.³ Wherever the phrase "a ratio between the costs of production of two commodities" occurs, cost of production cannot mean the aggregate of the diverse efforts and abstinences that have been required for the production of the commodity. Mill was aware, though, some of his critics forget,

(1) Mill's "Autobiography," pp. 246-7. Cairnes appears to me not to take sufficient account of the general plan of Mill's work. He takes no account of the vital importance which Mill found in the distinction between the human habits by which freedom of competition between various classes of labours is controlled, and the mechanical agencies by which exchanges are effected. Many of his criticisms almost imply that Mill's third book claims to be a complete treatise on Economics.

(2) This phrase occurs not only in the above passage, but also in the "Political Economy" (Bk. III., ch. i., § 1).

(3) Professor Cairnes implies (p. 75) that the law of cost of production is subject in this connexion to an important limitation which Mill has overlooked. Here again he seems not to have noticed the relation in which Mill's second book stands to his third.

that one aggregate of diverse efforts and abstinences does not bear a ratio to another. When we speak of ratio between an effort and an abstinence, or even between two diverse efforts, we assume, *ipso facto*, an artificial mode of measuring them in terms of some common unit, and refer to the ratio between their measures. The pure science of Ethics halts for lack of a system of measurement of efforts, sacrifices, desires, &c., fit for her wide purposes. But the pure science of Political Economy has found a system that will subserve her narrower aims. This discovery, rather than any particular proposition, is the great fact of the pure science.

It has been remarked that, in general, the truths by the discovery of which epochs in history have been made have been simple truths. An epoch has been created not by a new doctrine, but by the acquisition of the point of view from which the doctrine proceeded. A point of view was conquered for us by Adam Smith, from which a commodity is regarded as the embodiment of measurable efforts and sacrifices. Whosoever will put himself at this point of view may, with ease, see through fallacies which clouded the vision of statesmen not only of ancient times, but of an age that had gained the right point of view for the corresponding physical problem of the laws of motion of material masses.

Proceeding from its new point of view, Political Economy has analysed the efforts and sacrifices that are required for the production of a commodity for a given market at a given time; she has found a measure for them in their *cost to the person who will purchase them*, and then enunciated her central truth. This central truth is that producers, each governed under the sway of free competition by calculations of his own interest, will endeavour so to regulate the amount of any commodity which is produced for a given market during a given period, that this amount shall be just capable on the average of finding purchasers during this period at a remunerative price: a remunerative price being defined to be a price which shall be just equal to the sum of the exchange measures of those efforts and sacrifices which are required for the production of the commodity when this particular amount is produced, *i.e.*, to the sum of the expenses which must be incurred by a person who would purchase the performance of these efforts and sacrifices. Mill has retained the usage which applies to this sum the name "cost of production," without further explanation than is supplied by the context. I do not maintain that no advantage would have been gained if Mill had invented some new term for this sum, say "expenses of production," and had used the term "cost of production" only when he was speaking of efforts and sacrifices as they affected those who underwent them. I may concede that recent experience strengthens the arguments in favour of such a change, and I propose to say, in future, that the exchange-values of two com-

modities tend to bear to one another the same ratio as their *expenses of production*. But I maintain that when a ratio between costs of production is spoken of in the first chapters of Mill's third book, a misinterpretation, by which cost is referred to efforts instead of to measures of effort, is as inexcusable as one by which a traveller in New York or Nova Scotia should assume that allusions to *The Times*, or to *Halifax*, refer to *The Times* of London or the *Halifax* of Yorkshire. For besides guarding against such a misinterpretation implicitly, Mill puts a brief but clear warning against it into the most prominent place he could have chosen—the commencement of his chapter on the Analysis of Cost of Production. There, as I have said, he starts by an allusion to the fact that his treatment of labour *quâ* effort is to be found in his first book, and then says, "What the production of a thing costs to its producer, or its series of producers, is the labour expended in producing it."¹

The form into which I have thrown Mill's account of the relative values of commodities produced freely in the same country is chosen in order to make manifest the continuity that exists between this and other portions of his theory of value. Some persons fail to see that his "Law of Cost of Production" is regarded by him as operative only as a result of, or corollary from, the law according to which the action of the producers of a commodity is governed by their calculations of the circumstances of the future supply and demand in the market. He explains this briefly, perhaps too briefly, at the beginning of the third book of his Political Economy, and again in the following sentence:²—"The influence even of cost of production depends on supply; for the only thing which compels price, on the average, to conform to cost of production, is that if the price is either above or below that standard, it is brought back to it either by an increase or a diminution of the supply." The true nature of this doctrine would have been more manifest had not Mill, after Ricardo, judged it important to use terms that should bring into prominence the properties which distinguished rather than the properties which united the various propositions of the theory of value. The charges of inconsistency and confusion which have been brought against his account, as it now stands, by writers as learned as Mr. McLeod, and as powerful as Professor Jevons, establish, I think, conclusively, that his position would have been improved if he had adopted the other alternative. I propose, then, to speak of the form of exposition of Mill's central doctrine, which I have given on the preceding page, as the "Law of Free Production and Average Demand" (the word free

(1) Professor Cairnes (p. 50), after quoting a long passage from Mill, in which this sentence occurs, states that "the conception of cost which it suggests is radically unsound, confounding things in their own nature distinct and even antithetical, and setting in an essentially false light the incidents of production and exchange."

(2) *Fortnightly Review*, vol. v., N.S., p. 507.

being introduced in order to indicate that the law does not hold for the produce of a monopoly); and to speak of Mill's Laws of Cost of Production¹ (or as I should now say, "Expenses of Production") as corollaries from it.

One advantage of this mode of stating Mill's doctrine would be that it would render more clear his use of the terms "supply" and "demand." The circumstances of a market determine the particular exchange value, the expectation of which will suffice to induce producers to supply on the average any particular amount of a given commodity during a given period. These circumstances determine also the particular exchange value which will induce purchasers to demand on the average any particular amount of it during this period; the demand of each person being dependent upon² his means and the value in use to him of the commodity. Thus we must "mean by the word demand the quantity demanded, and remember that this is not a fixed quantity, but in general varies according to the value."³ Although Mill puts this statement in the most prominent place possible, and repeats it, some of his critics have not seen its full force.⁴ Thus we are to regard the average exchange value as under normal circumstances equating supply and demand; in this sense, that the circumstances of the market being supposed to be approximately uniform, the average exchange value will be such that the expectation of their obtaining this value for their commodity will cause producers on the average to supply just that amount which consumers are, on the average, just willing to purchase at that exchange value.

I do not think that Mill made his decision lightly when he determined in his theory of values "in an isolated country," to measure the transaction which he describes in terms of the quantity

(1) Mill, Bk. III., ch. iv., paragraphs xiii. and xiv. Mr. Carey proposes to say that the value of a commodity is equal to its cost of *reproduction*. He would thus avoid many small difficulties, but he would do serious mischief by diverting attention from the forces which govern supply in the first instance and value in the second.

(2) In mathematical language "a function of." I hold that much of what Professor Jevons says about "final utility" is contained, implicitly, at least, in Mill's account: but he has brought out with excellent distinctness many vital points connected with this notion, and has thereby made one of the most important of recent contributions to Economics.

(3) Mill, Bk. III., ch. ii., § 4^o

(4) This is a striking instance in which Cairnes presents his readers with one portion only of Mill's account. He says (p. 23), "Demand as there" [*i.e.* in the chapter from which I quote] "defined, is to be understood as measured, not, as my definition would require, by the quantity of purchasing power offered in support of the desire for commodities, but by the quantity of commodities for which such purchasing power is offered." He does not notice that Mill insists that the quantity demanded "varies according to the value." There is a great difference between the statements, "I will buy twelve eggs," and "I will buy a shilling's worth of eggs." But there is no substantive difference between the statement "I will buy twelve eggs at a penny each, but only six at three halfpence each," and the statement "I will expend a shilling on eggs at a penny each, but if they cost three halfpence each I will spend ninepence on them."

of the commodity in question.¹ Some years ago, under the influence of Cournot's thought,² I spent a long time in experimenting with various modes of expression for this theory, and for the theory of international values. I found that for the more elementary problems of either theory, almost any mode of expression would answer: but that for the more complex problems, that mode of expression which Mill has selected in the former theory, is the best adapted for it, and that which he has selected for the latter theory is the best adapted for it; and the experience of others who have concerned themselves with quantitative analysis, tends, as far as I can gather, in the same direction.³

We must, of course, always bear in mind the fundamental truth, that, to use Mill's words, that "which constitutes the means of payment for commodities . . . is simply commodities. Each person's means of paying for the productions of other people consists of those which he himself possesses. All sellers are inevitably, and by the meaning of the word, buyers. Could we suddenly double the productive powers of the country, we should double the supply of commodities in every market: but we should by the same stroke double the purchasing power. Everybody would bring a double demand as well as supply:"⁴ that is to say, the amount of each commodity which each person would be willing to purchase at a given exchange value would in general be doubled; and the amount which each producer of the commodity would be willing to supply at a given exchange value would be doubled.

Exactly corresponding is his account of market value. The amount which dealers offer for sale at any particular value is governed by their calculations of the present and future conditions of the markets with which they are directly and indirectly connected. There are some offers which none of them would accept: some offers which none of them would refuse. But those who can least afford to wait, and those whose expectation of the future condition of the market are the least sanguine, will just be induced to accept offers which others will just refuse. There is a particular exchange value at which each particular amount will be offered for sale, a particular value at which each particular amount can find purchasers. The higgling and the bargaining of the market tend to force the exchange value to that position which will just equate

(1) As mathematicians would say, to select this quantity for his independent variable.

(2) "*Recherches sur les Principes Mathematiques de la Theorie des Richesses*," Paris, 1838.

(3) This is one of many instances in which Professor Cairnes might, I think, have appreciated Ricardo's and Mill's work more truly if he had not given his chief attention to qualitative analysis, to the neglect of quantitative analysis.

(4) Bk. III., chap. xiv., § 2. Professor Cairnes insists upon this truth *e.g.* p. 27. But he has not observed that a recognition of it governs the whole course of Mill's reasonings.

supply and demand: *i.e.*, to make the exchange value such that the amount which dealers are willing to sell at that value, is equal to the amount which can find purchasers at that value.

It is true that Mill does not explain this carefully in his *Political Economy*. The theory of market values was considered by economists as of slight importance, until Mr. Thornton's book *On Labour* appeared. Mr. Thornton's work is not free from faults; but he has not received his due meed of gratitude for having led men to a point of view from which the practical importance of the theory of market values is clearly seen. In particular he led Mill to give an exposition of his views on the subject.¹

Mill, following Adam Smith, insisted on the doctrine, that fluctuations of the market price, above and below the average price, are injurious to the community.² Some of the subtlest arguments for and against "protection to native industry," turn on the principles involved in these doctrines; but such arguments have not, as far as I am aware, received attention in this country.

A few words may be said on Mill's use of "cost of production" in his theory of international values. It has been argued above that when he speaks of the machinery of exchange as causing the values of commodities freely produced at home to bear to one another on the average the ratio of their costs of production, it would be certain, even without the explanation which he supplies, that he is speaking not of the efforts and sacrifices that were required for the production of the several commodities, but of their exchange measures. The pure theory of international values is based on the hypothesis, that there is no migration of labour or capital from one country to another, and that therefore there exist no artificial and precise common measures of efforts, and sacrifices undergone in different countries. Therefore the machinery of exchange knows nothing of any comparison between the costs of production of commodities produced in different countries. When, therefore, Mill makes any sort of comparison between such costs, we may be certain (1) that he is speaking of the efforts and sacrifices themselves, and not of their measures, and (2) that he is not professing to make an exact quantitative statement. And this is the fact.³ He repeats indeed from Ricardo the remark that, on the hypothesis that capital and labour do not circulate freely

(1) I am unable to conjecture how Cairnes has managed so to misinterpret him as to make the startling statement (p. 117), "We desire to know the circumstances which determine price; and we are told that the selling price is always such that the quantity of a commodity purchased in a given market is equal to the quantity sold in that market. The statement is incontrovertible, but I fail to see how it helps us to understand the facts."

(2) What Professor Cairnes says on this subject (pp. 123, &c.) appears to me to be in substance true, as far as it goes, and important. But he seems to me again to have overlooked some of the work of his predecessors.

(3) Cairnes appears not to have noticed this: hence he charges Mill with grave inconsistencies.

between countries, a commodity may exchange for another produced in a different country, though the efforts and sacrifices involved in the production of the one, have been much greater than those involved for the other; and the remark that a commodity may be systematically imported into a country which has greater natural facilities for producing it than are possessed by the country from which it is obtained. But these are merely negative statements: they are not constituent portions of the theory. The functions which they discharge do not require that the terms in which they are expressed should be capable of precise quantitative interpretation. We have not to decide what is the number of sugar-canes the labour of cutting which under a tropical sun is to be regarded as equivalent to that of getting a ton of iron ore, in order that we may be able to assent to the proposition that the production of the sugar we obtain in exchange for our iron, *may not* have cost just as much labour as the production of the iron did, but may have cost either more or less labour. Whenever, in the constructive portions of the theory, mention is made of a ratio between costs of production, reference is had to two commodities produced freely in the same country; the machinery of exchange is exhibited as weighing the expenses of production, as I propose to say, of the two commodities. It is true, doubtless, that Mill has not guarded against mistaken renderings of his words with sufficient fulness of iteration, but what he has written suffices logically to exclude false renderings; and there are few thoughtful students who fail to perceive the main drift of his reasonings.¹

There is much to be said of the manner in which the pure theory of values in an isolated country, and the pure theory of international values are intended to supplement each other in Mill's system; the powers of the two theories being combined for the solution of problems relating to the trade, that is actually carried on between (say) two different sets of people in England, or between England and America. But I must content myself here with calling attention to the hints and the facts bearing on this subject that are contained in Mr. Cliffe Leslie's eminently instructive and suggestive writings on wages and prices.

ALFRED MARSHALL.

(1) Great as is the value of Professor Cairnes's constructive and explanatory remarks on this subject, he does not seem to me to have fully entered into Mill's position. For instance, when speaking of the American protectionists, he says (p. 67), "they ask, how can we, with our high-priced labour, compete with the pauper labour of Europe? I must frankly own that, accepting the point of view of the current theory of cost, I can find no satisfactory reply to this question." Mill's answer is, of course, that if American producers generally should be unable to compete with English producers at the present rates of wages, a flow of gold (Cairnes here regards wages in America as measured in gold) from America to England would set in; by which ultimately a general fall in the prices of labour and commodities in America would be effected, until American producers gained possession of the market with regard to those commodities, in the reduction of which they are at the greatest advantage or the least disadvantage.

MADAME DE MAINTENON.¹

THE law of the old French monarchy which excluded women from direct inheritance of the throne, by no means excluded them from great and often paramount influence in affairs of State. Indeed it would not be difficult to show that in few European countries has female authority been more frequent and predominant than in the country which boasted the Salic law. Whether as indigenous mistresses or imported queens, women shaped the policy and wielded the power of the French kings to a degree which could not be easily.

(1) A singular ill fortune has attended Madame de Maintenon's literary remains. The task of publishing her letters in the first instance fell into the hands of an adventurer of some talent and more impudence—Laurent Angliviel de la Beaumelle. His edition, several times reprinted in the eighteenth century, has been accepted as fairly trustworthy down to recent times; the more so as he was known to have been assisted by the ladies of St. Cyr, who furnished him with valuable original documents. It now appears that his edition teems with forgeries of the most flagitious kind. He not only tampered with the text of genuine letters, often actually re-writing them and interpolating fraudulent additions of his own, but he forged whole letters by the dozen whenever unwelcome gaps in the authentic correspondence suggested or permitted the deception. The almost incredible extent of his imposture was only exposed when the late M. Théophile Lavallée commenced his edition of Madame de Maintenon's General correspondence. M. Lavallée had himself been a dupe, like all preceding writers, of La Beaumelle's mendacity. About twenty years ago the need of a new and critical edition of Madame de Maintenon's letters and other works was much felt, and two editors devoted themselves to the task, independently and in ignorance of each other's labours, the Duc de Noailles and M. Lavallée. M. Guizot brought them into communication, and M. Lavallée was charged with the whole undertaking. Unhappily, he has died before completing his task, only four volumes having appeared of his edition of the Letters, which was intended to comprise ten.

M. Lavallée had a *culte* for Madame de Maintenon, and his work, extending over twelve years, devoted to her memory, was truly a labour of love. He disinterred autograph letters, whenever they had been preserved, and accepted only such copies as were guaranteed by being transcriptions from the originals made by the ladies of St. Cyr. It was on confronting these authentic documents with La Beaumelle's edition that the magnitude of the latter's fraud was first brought fully to light. It is not too much to say that Madame de Maintenon has been hitherto chiefly known and painted on the faith of this unscrupulous inventor. Even the best and most recent books are filled with his fabrications; e.g., Henri Martin, in his elaborate and painstaking "History of France," quotes almost exclusively the apocryphal letters; expressions as familiar as household words, supposed to be Madame de Maintenon's, are now proved to be fictions of La Beaumelle's. For instance, the famous sentences, "Je le renvoie toujours affligé, jamais désespéré," "Cela m'engage à approuver des choses fort opposées à mes sentiments," etc., etc., are not Madame de Maintenon's at all, though it is difficult to banish them from the mind. As M. Lavallée says, it will take a long time before the false impression created by La Beaumelle's imposture is dispelled, if it ever is entirely.

Of course, we have to take M. Lavallée's word for these statements. But I believe his honourable character has never been doubted, and his work proves him to have been a most painstaking and well-informed editor. When I quote Madame de Maintenon's letters, it is to his edition I refer, except when otherwise indicated.

matched in any other royal house of Europe. During considerable periods of French history the titular king is a shadow, and the foreground of politics is occupied by a vigorous queen (regent or consort), or an ambitious concubine. From Blanche of Castille and Agnès Sorel, to Madame de Pompadour and Marie Antoinette, French politics repeatedly fell into feminine hands. The result was not often fortunate for France. Although that country has perhaps produced as many eminent women as the rest of Europe put together, it has not been happy in its female rulers. We look in vain through its annals for any woman on or near the throne that can be compared with Isabella of Spain, Elizabeth of England, or Maria Theresa of Austria. The most beautiful and lofty female character, in all history, does indeed belong to French politics; but the incomparable maid of Domremy was far from any legitimate or illegitimate connection with the throne. In all despotic monarchies the too frequent accident of a weak and uxorious prince leads naturally to the domination of intriguing women and courtly parasites. The foreign queens, or the beauties of native growth who supplant them, have rarely much inducement to make a magnanimous use of their power. That women are capable in a high degree of the sentiment of patriotism, will be denied only by the uncandid or the ignorant. But the Salic law, excluded from Government precisely those women who by birth and education would have been most likely to be inspired by that noble passion. Anne de Beaujeu showed that a French king's daughter could be far more worthy to bear rule than her brother, the king's son. There were imperial qualities in la Grande Mademoiselle, which might make us wish that her lofty, if also somewhat fantastic daring, had found a fitter theatre than the grotesque tragi-comedy of the Fronde.

Among the women who have left a lasting name and mark in French history, Madame de Maintenon undoubtedly holds a prominent, if not a chief place. The length of her reign, and the durability of her influence are without parallel. As Louis XIV. reigned longer than any other king of France, so Madame de Maintenon occupied the position of chief favourite for a longer period than any one before or after her. Her extraordinary career, during which she travelled from the lowest depths of poverty and obscurity to the loftiest place but one in Europe, has struck the imagination and curiosity, both of contemporaries and posterity. Her exalted, but to the end ambiguous position, had the same effect, and contributed to endow her with that air of mystery of which few minds escape the fascination. She herself said she should be an enigma to posterity, and she seems rather to have liked the reflection than otherwise. The object at once of unbounded adulation and unscrupulous calumny, reserved and self-contained to the verge of

duplicity, she has left a reputation which to this day remains in the half-light which partakes of legend. Two legends concerning her had commenced before her death, one highly flattering, the other as hostile. According to one, she was an apparition well-nigh or quite miraculous, a sort of courtly Joan of Arc, divinely appointed to convert a licentious king from his immoral ways; according to the other, she was a miracle of crafty intrigue, who, with a subtlety hardly human, had bewitched an aged monarch into humiliating subjection to her. We are not reduced to a random guess that the truth probably lies between these two extremes. Enough remains in her own handwriting (though it is conjectured that she destroyed nine-tenths of her correspondence) to show us that she was equally removed from the angelic character, whether dark or light. The pretension of her unreserved admirers, past and present, that all her actions were inspired by a pure and lofty piety, that she submitted for years to a court life of hot intrigue in a company the least virtuous from motives of perfect virtue, can only be met by a smile. The pretension of her unreserved enemies, that she with forecasting insight played, without conscience or scruple, her deep game of hypocrisy and ambition for the sake of worldly honour, can only be met in the same way. Madame de Maintenon in this respect has only received the common measure of justice and injustice which usually falls to those who attain extraordinary preeminence after starting from relatively lowly beginnings. The ambitious climber to the giddy height is credited with a profound plan of operations from the first, with a distinct view of the distant goal ultimately reached, but designed all along, and with the artifice and cunning needed to secure the stages which led to it. The end of the career is supposed to explain its commencement. The earliest steps were taken in reference to the path along which the last were meant to fall. It is thus that Caesar is supposed to have set out to conquer Gaul with the settled intention of conquering the Senate afterwards, and Cromwell to have entered the Long Parliament with the matured purpose of bringing Charles I. to the scaffold. Such conceptions are wanting in imaginative grasp and reality. They suppose that human life can be written out like a well-conned play, and that the dim future years can be seen through and fitted with appropriate stage directions. Inapplicable to the most audacious and inventive schemers for power, this notion is peculiarly misplaced with regard to Madame de Maintenon. Few of her equals in ability and force of character have had so little ideal lift of spirit, or of an eye far-reaching, and bent on distant horizons. Less than most was she given to building castles in the air, or to regarding as present what still lay hidden in the womb of the future. On the contrary, her success and her strength lay in her complete sobriety of temper, and

a patience that could not be wearied. If she could have foreseen her career it is probable she would never have attempted it. Not soaring genius, but consummate common sense was her quality. It was far less ambition than the most watchful prudence that directed her steps, and both prudence and common sense would have dissuaded her from a path which she ultimately trod without a fall.

Frances d'Aubigné, afterwards Madame Scarron and Marquise de Maintenon, came of an ancient family originally from Anjou. None of her ancestors were distinguished except her grandfather, the famous Agrippa d'Aubigné, the friend and companion in arms of Henry IV., and one of the most strenuous and original characters of the sixteenth century. One of the fathers of French prose and a copious writer of vigorous verse, he was also one of the most fierce and intrepid warriors of that wild time. He was presented to Henry as a man "who found nothing too hot for him," and he proved the correctness of the character abundantly, especially by saving Henry's life at the risk of his own. The valiant old Huguenot had a most unworthy son named Constant d'Aubigné, a depraved and feeble libertine, who was twice saved from the gallows by his father's influence. But the foolish creature, not content with spending his substance, and committing rape and murder, conspired against Cardinal Richelieu, for which he was imprisoned for many years, and only released by the Cardinal's death. Constant had for second wife (he had killed his first) Jeanne de Cardilhac, a brave woman, but soured by her trials and domestic unhappiness. She went to share her scandalous husband's prison at Niort, and there, in the extreme of privation, she gave birth, 27th November, 1635, to a girl, who afterwards became Madame de Maintenon.¹

Frances had a wretched childhood, the gloom and misery of which were never effaced from her mind. Her mother went to Paris, and lived there in extreme poverty, in pursuit of hopeless lawsuits. Her abandoned father persevered in his vices. Her early years were tended by a paternal aunt, Madame de Villette, for whom, to the end of her life, she retained the most affectionate memory. At length a brighter prospect seemed to open before the unfortunate family. The French of the seventeenth century were not so unable or unwilling to emigrate as they have since become, and Constant d'Aubigné, now sixty years old, solicited and obtained the post of Governor of Marie-Galante, situate in Martinique. The exiles sailed a family of five, the father, mother, two boys, and a girl, the latter, Frances, not quite ten years old. On the voyage Frances sickened even unto apparent death. She was about to be buried in the sea, when her mother insisted on once more seeing her child,

(1) "*La famille d'Aubigné et l'enfance de Madame de Maintenon*," p. 77, par Théophile Lavallée.

and finding the heart's action had not stopped, she declared that her daughter was not dead, and saved her from the deep. It was a narrow escape. The cannon was already charged, to be fired as she dropped into the ocean, when her mother's importunity rescued her. The fact is the more singular, as Jeanne d'Aubigné seems to have been a harsh, unloving mother. Her daughter said she had never been kissed by her but twice in her life. It is probable that maternal coldness was assisted by religious estrangement. Her aunt, Madame de Villette, was like her father Agrippa, a staunch Huguenot, and had brought up Frances in her own faith; but her mother was a Catholic. Once when she took her to mass the little Calvinist turned her back to the altar, for which her ears were boxed; but she bore the punishment with pride, and gloried in suffering for her religion.

The Martinique adventure did not prosper. Constant d'Aubigné remained an incurable spendthrift to the end. Though in want of means, he yet gave his wife a staff of twenty-four slaves to wait upon her. At the end of two years he died, and his widow and children at once returned to France. Again Frances tasted the bitterness of dependence, and the cold welcome of indifferent relations. She fell into the custody of a Madame de Neuillant, an aunt by marriage, who made her a mere drudge in her farmyard, set her to mind her poultry, and shod her with sabots. The religious difficulty again came up, and she was both coaxed and coerced towards a change of faith. Her precocious shrewdness was by this time enlightened as to the position of a Huguenot in France, and her conversion to Catholicism seems to have been a smooth and easy business. In her seventeenth year she met the burlesque writer, Paul Scarron.

Scarron, though barely passed middle age, was a helpless cripple, having only the use of "his right hand, his eyes, and his tongue." But his indomitable vivacity triumphed over his bodily infirmities, and he was regarded as one of the brightest wits and authors of his time. His writings belong to a school as antiquated and forgotten in French literature as the writings of Lilly and Cowley are in ours. They have that perverted ingenuity and laborious pleasantry which seem to us so dreary. There are few less amusing books than his once famous "*Roman Comique*." Yet Scarron found an ardent admirer in the great Racine, and in any case his house was the resort of the most approved wit and fashion of Paris. Frances d'Aubigné's forlorn condition touched the kind heart of the afflicted joker, and he offered her either to pay her entrance fee in a good convent, or marriage. She chose the latter alternative. She was less than half his age, and though called his wife, was never anything but his nurse. In spite of his maladies, Scarron kept open house, and the company, though distinguished by rank and intelligence, was free,

not to say licentious in conversation. The demure matron of seventeen was at once put upon her mettle, and she soon showed the stuff of which she was made. In three months she had banished all indecorum from her husband's table, and so impressed his companions with her worth and dignity, that one of them said if he were offered the choice of behaving in an unbecoming manner to the Queen (Anne of Austria) or to her, he would prefer doing so to the Queen. With that she was a tender helpmeet, not only ruling his household, but assisting him in his literary work. For eight years the strange union lasted with mutual satisfaction. At his death, Scarron said he had but one regret, that he was unable to leave his wife better off than he did. He indeed left her little but debts. Only a few weeks before his death an incident occurred of singular irony. On August 26th, 1660, Louis XIV. entered Paris with all the pomp which the Court and the capital could command, on the occasion of his marriage with his young queen, Maria Theresa of Spain. Paris had never seen such a show. The nobles and the municipal authorities vied with each other in lavish magnificence, and the procession lasted through the long hours of a summer's day. Madame Scarron witnessed it as an obscure spectator, and wrote an account of it to a friend. "Nothing," she says to her correspondent, "nothing I or any one could say could give you an idea of the magnificent spectacle; nothing could surpass it." Twenty-four years afterwards Madame Scarron herself, after a marriage service carefully concealed, celebrated by night in the palace of Versailles, became the young queen's successor.¹

On Scarron's death, she had again to face the world without resources. But now she had made influential friends, and she presently procured a pension from the Queen Mother. It was small, but Madame Scarron was a mistress of thrift and economical resource. Her inexpensive and simple attire was not without a certain grave *coquetterie*, and she was careful to be *bien chaussée*. Her remarkable beauty—she was generally called *la belle Indienne*—the charm of her manner and conversation, caused her company to be eagerly sought after. But she had another gift more adapted than these to make her friendship valued, and that was a power of rendering herself infinitely serviceable to all whom she approached. Trained in the hard school of adversity, her natural endowment as a *ménagère* had been developed to a supreme degree. No household that had once received Madame Scarron, but missed and regretted her when she left it. In the drawing-room, the kitchen, or the sick-room she was equally pleasing and unobtrusively useful: but in the nursery, her innate love of children, and skill in their management, made her presence almost indispensable. In rendering these offices,

(1) "Correspondance Générale," vol. i., p. 72.

she never spared trouble or pains. On one occasion she nursed an old lady for three months without leaving the house. On another, she not only took charge of Madame de Montchevreuil's house and children, but attended to the sale of the farm stock as well. When one of her friends got married, the whole preparation of the wedding devolved upon her. It is easy to understand that such a woman was welcome and popular, and what a valuable education she thus acquired for her subsequent career.

Madame Scarron's virtue is not so exhausted a topic in France as the similar one concerning Queen Elizabeth, is in England. It is still discussed with some vivacity by her blind admirers and blind detractors, who seem to have inherited the passions of her friends and foes in the palace of Versailles. Saint Simon's calumnies against her are still accepted or laid aside with only partial sincerity, by the one; on the other hand, the reverence felt for her by her novices at St. Cyr, does not seem excessive or unwarranted to the others. The unprejudiced inquirer will agree with Ste. Beuve that the evidence against her correctness of conduct is not worth attending to. The fact that she was acquainted, not intimate, with Ninon de l'Enclos, a friend of her husband, has been made the ground of the most injurious inferences and statements. The animosity of her enemies has blinded them to consistency of character. Every trustworthy record proves that Madame de Maintenon moved in a plane which diverged at right angles from the path which leads to sins of the flesh. It was not that she resisted such temptations; she was not aware of them. It was her favourite maxim that an irreproachable behaviour is also the cleverest, in a worldly sense. She acknowledged that a wish to stand well with the world, and win its esteem, was her master passion, and that "she *hated* everything that could expose her to contempt." Her clear and subtle intellect grew out of a soil covered with snow. She owned that it was not out of love that she sedulously nursed her sick friend for three months, but in order to acquire a good reputation. It would be ungenerous to construe this avowal against her too literally. If not warm, she was singularly constant in her affections, and longsuffering even to timidity. Setting aside her religious principles, of which none but the uncandid will dispute the persistency, even if they deny their fervour, it is evident that in her cool, sedate mind, the impulses in question found no place. Far greater and richer would she have been if they had. Her lips were never touched with fire, and no flame, holy or unholy, ever burned in the depths of her heart.

For about ten years Madame Scarron, after her husband's death, led an agreeable life in the most refined circles of Parisian society. She was on terms of intimacy with Madame de Sevigné, who was struck with the mingled amiability and accuracy of her mind. They

supped every night together, and Madame de Sevigné pronounced her company "delicious." It was in these circumstances that a proposition was made to her (the exact date is not known—probably in 1670) which gave a new direction to her fortunes, and one very different from anything she could have expected. She was asked to take charge of certain children of her friend Madame de Montespan; and their father was rumoured to be no other than the king of France.

We now enter upon a period of her life beset with doubt, obscurity, and legend, through which it is difficult to see one's way to trustworthy fact. We have the saintly legend on the one hand (which she herself in her latter years carefully propagated), representing her as the pure soul who, from the loftiest motives, entered the corrupt atmosphere of the court, and that by the most suspicious of back doors. On the other side is the legend which exhibits her in a character but little removed from that of a procuress, with an ambition as mean as it was unscrupulous. The situation, and the person who filled it, afford material of singular dramatic interest, in which the play of a subtle and complex character, winds and circulates amid circumstances more complex still. Our interest in Madame de Maintenon is quenched as soon as we regard her exclusively in the light of either legend, either as a woman of guileless sincerity, or as an accomplished intriguer, devoid of all conscience. She derives her peculiar attraction and piquancy precisely from the constant interaction of contending motives of worldly wisdom and spiritual aspiration, between her struggles to secure a high place at court, and a safe, final retreat to the kingdom of heaven. She pursued both ends with an energy which never relented, and showed a tenacity which cannot be surpassed in her resolution to make the best of both worlds.

She met the tempting offer to take charge of the King's natural children, with refined diplomacy. With Madame de Montespan's children she said she could have no concern, but if the children in question were indeed the King's, and his Majesty were pleased to lay his commands upon her, she was ready to obey. A widow in narrow circumstances might have been excused if she had shown less self-control and insight in the presence of an offer which promised emolument and a secure future. But Madame Scarron saw to the bottom of the situation at once, and how different would be her position if she were employed by the King, or only by his mistress. The King did lay his commands upon her, and at once, with prompt energy, she took the whole burden of her new office. This burden was no light one. The most complete secrecy was one of the stipulations, and she conformed to it with an exactness which would have done credit to a commissary of police. She was lodged with her young charges in a roomy house in the then remote quarter

of the Rue de Vaugirard, but concealed, with an innate genius for dissimulation which could dispense with teaching, her new occupation even from her most intimate friends. With unconscious *naïveté* she boasted in after life of her successful duplicity, and confided to the virgin innocents of St. Cyr the story of her adroit management in hiding the results of sin. "Often," she said, "I passed the whole night watching by the bedside of one of those children when unwell. I returned home by a back door in the morning, and, after dressing, I went out in a carriage from the front door to the Hotel d'Albret, or Richelieu, in order that my usual circle might not suspect that I had any secret to keep." She frequently went on foot to escape notice, and carefully disguised, carrying under her arm clothes, and even food, doing any household work that presented itself, in preference to admitting indiscreet strangers.¹

Not only Christian saintliness but a strong sense of human dignity might have shrunk from such offices. We must remember that after all such behaviour was fairly in accordance with the views of the courtly world at the time. Vice was not vice when practised by a king. Madame Colbert had taken charge in a similar way of Mademoiselle de la Vallière's children, and nobody was shocked. Neither is Madame de Maintenon shocked. But her new position brought out prominently, perhaps fully revealed, to herself for the first time the two master motives which guided her through life, worldly advancement, and salvation in the next world. No one knew better than she that the licentious court of Louis XIV. was about the last place in which a sensitive piety could feel safe or happy. On the other hand, no courtier at St. Germain or Versailles was more determined to push his fortunes by pleasing the king. Hence an inward conflict which required to be quelled. Hence the need of a sophistry to deceive self and others as regarded the impulse which retained her in a position so inconsistent with her principles of religious severity. She knew well that she was envied rather than blamed for the post she had secured, but she insists on being pitied for it, strives to make herself and others believe that she does violence to her feelings by remaining in it, and that her one anxiety is to get away. She was much helped in this rather difficult task by a judicious choice of a confessor, an intelligent toady, the Abbé Gobelin, who was careful to advise her to do precisely what he saw she wished. We may well believe that he at an early period assured her it was her duty to remain at court however painful it might be. Churchmen in Louis XIV.'s time knew the value of court favour, and a person so near the king as the governess of his children was too valuable a friend to be allowed to indulge in weak scruples about the spiritual healthiness of the place. In the first instance the rather slow-witted

(1) "Correspondance Générale," vol. I., p. 146

Louis had felt a dread of Madame Scarron, her reputation as a *bel esprit* was a little alarming to his dignity. It was only through Madame de Montespan's influence that his repugnance was overcome. But when he knew her better and saw her closer a great change took place in his impressions. He discovered that the demure and humble head nurse of his children possessed an intellect which by its culture, delicacy and penetration eclipsed the boisterous vigour of his mistress. He found his way with increased frequency to her apartment, and seemed to take more pleasure in his visits the oftener they were made. What did these things mean? Though verging on forty Madame Scarron still retained much of her early beauty, the severity of her morals had long been celebrated, her reprobation of unchastity was notorious. The court, as a microcosm of France, contained a devout party, as well as parties who were by no means devout. These good men, of whom the Duc de Montausier and Bossuet were the recognised chiefs, while reverencing their king to the verge of idolatry, were yet pained beyond expression by his licentious life: his frailty in the presence of female beauty tarnished in their eyes all the surpassing glories of his reign. If he could only be converted to virtuous habits nothing would remain to be desired; but his inclination to appropriate to himself the wives of other men was a menacing evil which threatened to bring the country to ruin. His wars and reckless expenditure, and the widespread misery they caused, were visitations in which piety saw an Almighty hand. These were calamities from which one should pray to be delivered. But the king's incontinency was a misfortune far more urgent and dangerous than any of these. And yet it was a difficult subject to approach. Mascaron, by a sermon of indiscreet zeal on the observance of the seventh commandment, had drawn upon himself rebuke and disgrace. Perhaps the same sentiments from the mouth of a pretty woman might be better received. With whom the thought originated does not appear. But it is certain that the devout party were not long in coming to the conclusion that Madame Scarron might be successfully used as a sort of female missionary to bring about the conversion of the king. Herewith a prospect opened before her beyond the dreams of hope or ambition. All contradictions were reconciled. Piety and patriotism, charity for her neighbour, just pride in her king, all converged to command her to stay at court, to save his soul and make her own fortune.

But although the theory was clear, its application was beset with difficulties. The elements of the problem were complex and not easily co-ordinated. Firstly, there was the large debt of gratitude to Madame de Montespan for her introduction to court. Secondly, there was the king's passion for his mistress still at a high temperature. Thirdly, there were the children to be reared in dutiful

reverence to the king, but in a strange ambiguous attitude towards their mother. Fourthly, there were the interests of religion which commanded the expulsion of the benefactress, and a thorough reformation of the king's habits. The skill with which Madame Scarron rode these four horses abreast proves her to have been endowed with very extraordinary qualities. She commenced by putting herself in a safe position against any reproaches of the mistress, by exhorting her to a godly life. Loyal friendship, christian charity, could not do less than warn an erring sister of the danger of her ways. But after this frankness she was free to speak to the king, when opportunity offered, and the ample mantle of religious zeal was more than sufficient to shelter her from all insinuations of ingratitude or self-seeking. As regards the children, the obstacles were trifling, Madame Scarron's pure and perfect love of children is one of the most attractive traits in her character. It cost her nothing to win their love from their harsh and imperious mother. Remained the fourth impediment, the king's attachment to his mistress.

No sacred bard, or, what would have been much better, no prying, eavesdropping Boswell has painted for us the "terrible scenes" which soon ensued. When it at last became clear to Montespan that her creature, her underling, her drudge, was threatening to become her rival, the explosion of choler, as we may well conceive, was very grand indeed. Pent up together in a narrow space at Versailles or St. Germain, the two ladies were brought into daily, almost hourly, contact. It was a situation to bring out the fighting qualities of tame women, and neither of these was tame, though they differed much in their style of courage. It says a good deal for their self-command that they never came to blows. Once apparently they nearly did, when they suffered themselves to be surprised by the King in a crisis so violent that he found them quite hot with the ardour of battle. With a simplicity which must have been feigned, he asked what was the matter. Madame Scarron recovered her calm on the instant, and made answer, "If your Majesty will pass into the adjoining apartment, I shall have the honour of telling you."¹ Montespan let them go, choked, we may presume, with floods of rage, bewilderment, and despair. Her soft, feline enemy then unbosomed herself to the King, told of the harshness, the injustice, the cruelty of Madame de Montespan, and struck an attitude, we may depend, in which piety, beauty, and Christian resignation struggled to produce a complete effect. "Have you not remarked," said the King, rather ungallantly, "how her fine eyes

(1) "Il se passe ici des choses terribles entre Madame de Montespan et moi : le roi en fut hier témoin."—"Correspondance Générale," vol. i., p. 254.—Mem. de Madame de Caylus.

fill with tears whenever she hears of a touching and generous action?" It was a churlish question, and must have been a heavy blow, showing that fine eyes might still be a match for religious lovemaking, and a menacing hint not to proceed too fast, or attempt to carry matters with a high hand. But Madame de Maintenon's endurance and tenacity of patience were more than equal to the emergency. "I spoke yesterday," she writes to the toady confessor, "to Madame de Montespan, and begged her and the King not to consider any ill-humour I showed as a proof of sulkiness towards them. She and I are again to have a conference this morning. I intend to be very soft in all I say; still I remain firm in the intention to leave them at the end of the year, and I shall employ my time till then in praying God to lead me where it will be best for my salvation."¹ It would no doubt be difficult to draw, with perfect equity, the line here which separated subtle self-deception from half-conscious hypocrisy. That both were present we may charitably believe—cant and sincerity; or, as Mr. Carlyle says, "sincere cant." However, men and women must fight the battle of life with such weapons as they can command, and neither cant nor sincerity could be dispensed with in this crisis. With a devout party anxiously looking on and watching this singular duel between two strange champions, with an immoral party equally anxious and supporting the cause of "fine eyes," one could not afford to give points. All the more reason for making one's own side feel the value of the services rendered. "I know," she writes to the useful confessor, "that I can save myself here, but I think I could do it better elsewhere. I cannot believe it is God's wish that I should suffer from Madame de Montespan. I have a thousand times desired to take the vows, and the fear of repenting such a step has made me pass over impulses which many would have considered proofs of vocation." The confessor, for once, proved himself a dunce as well as a toady, and began to take her at her word, and hinted belief in her wish to adopt a religious life. She lost no time in undeceiving him. "I have expressed myself badly," she writes, "if you understood that I was thinking of becoming a nun. I am too old to change my position now, and according to the fortune I receive from the King" (she was justly expecting a fitting reward for the trouble she had taken with his children), "I shall set about establishing myself in perfect quietude."² Before her brother, less diplomacy was required, and to him she says, "It

(1) "Je priais le roi et elle de ne point regarder la mauvaise humeur où je leur paraissais comme une bouderie contre eux. . . . Madame de Montespan et moi devons nous parler ce matin : ce sera de ma part avec beaucoup de douceur."—"Correspondance Générale," vol. i., p. 212.

(2) "Je me suis mal expliquée, si vous avez compris que je pense à être religieuse; je suis trop vieille pour changer de condition."—"Correspondance Générale," vol. i., p. 210.

was thought I had been got rid of here" (at Versailles), "but you who know me will also know that I am not so easily got rid of."¹ These extracts, taken from her letters written at the moment, which might be indefinitely multiplied, give a very different impression from that of the simpering legend which, long years after, she propagated for the edification of her novices of St. Cyr, in which she appears as the meek and miraculous instrument of a higher power, and touching victim sacrificed to the needs of state.

At last Montespan's broad moon of favour waned, narrowed, and disappeared, and Maintenon waxed brighter than ever in anti-theatrical splendour. Her unflinching admirers await us here with arguments, they deem demonstrative of her pious and perfect disinterestedness. Between Montespan's eclipse and the queen's death, they ask us how to explain her conduct except on the hypothesis of her unselfish regard for the king's morals, her devout yearning to make him a model of continency and Christian virtue. The queen, we are told, declared that under God she owed it to Madame de Maintenon, that after twenty years of neglect her husband began to treat her with kindness. It is supposed that this evidence of Madame de Maintenon's purity of motive cannot be resisted. She could not have foreseen, it is remarked, the queen's proximate death. She could not, if she had, have aimed at taking her place, and as for taking the place of Montespan, it cannot even be mentioned with propriety. Therefore pure religion, and undefiled by worldly interest, alone impelled her. Is this conclusion quite clear? Let us grant that she reconciled husband and wife. Let her have all the credit which such an achievement deserves. From her point of view it was a triumph fitted to win the applause of angels, and we need not doubt that her good work was its own reward. Let us also loudly proclaim that her own virtue was impeccable, and that she would have given her body to be burned, rather than yield a hair's breadth to unchastity. But was there no other path open along which ambition could move? Was there not a place vacant for a female confessor, or rather was not that place already admirably filled in the unanimous opinion of the godly by Madame de Maintenon herself? And was it not a place of surpassing honour, and exquisite in its singularity? Let us imagine a woman in whom the vulgar passions are extinct, or rather never existed: let us suppose her with a strong propensity to a formal and legal righteousness, who coupled therewith a deep but wary ambition. Thus stated, the problem is as good as solved. But farther, was the queen a hindrance, or not rather a valuable instrument in her hand? The queen was not a rival to be feared for a moment—the poor meek woman who stood in

(1) ". . . l'on crut être défait de nous. Vous croirez bien, vous qui nous connaissez, que l'on ne s'en défait pas si aisément."—"Correspondance Générale," vol. i., p. 336.

such awe of the king, that she trembled in every limb when he sent for her unexpectedly. What would have been dangerous was another young mistress of Madame de Montespan type, brilliant and enterprising, who might soon make havoc of the king's good resolutions, and fill the faces of the devout with shame and confusion. But while the queen lived, and the king remained on good terms with her—and the female confessor who had done so much might be trusted to ensure that—a pledge for his good behaviour was, so to speak, held in hand. So far from being an obstacle, the queen was a most useful pawn in Madame de Maintenon's game, and we may well believe that her death filled the latter with no slight perturbation. It changed indeed the position into a critical phase. Madame de Maintenon's place, beside a widower, was very different from what it had been beside a married man, protected by his wife. Would the newly-acquired virtue of the king remain firm? Policy dissuaded another marriage with some foreign princess. Another young royal family was not to be desired in the state of the finances, but no one could guarantee that one would not arrive, if the king married again. But what was the alternative? Madame de Maintenon, we are told, at this time passed through a period of mental anxiety, very unusual to her austere and self-controlled temper. She not only shed abundant tears, but became so restless that she roamed in the forest of Fontainebleau, with a single companion, sometimes even at unseemly hours. The few letters she wrote at this epoch reveal profound agitation of spirit. Presently the clouds break, and she is seen sitting in lofty calm, radiant with a happiness which she does not explain. It is probable that during this trying interval the proposition of her marriage with the king was discussed and decided in the affirmative. We may well believe that so momentous a decision was not arrived at without aching doubt and hesitation. The exact date of the marriage has never been divulged. All that is known is that probably in June 1684 seven persons were assembled at midnight in one of the private apartments of the palace of Versailles. These were the king and his bride, Father la Chaise, who said mass, the archbishop of Paris who gave the nuptial blessing, Louvois and Montchevreuil who were witnesses, and Bontemps, the first *valet de chambre*, who prepared the altar and served the mass. The widow of Paul Scarron had become the actual but unrecognised queen of France. She was forty-nine, and the king forty-six years of age.

J. COTTER MORISON.

(To be concluded in the next number.)

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE two great free governments of the world are for the moment passing under a cloud. America is disgraced by the exposure of administrative corruption, and England by more than one exhibition of parliamentary levity and hypocrisy.

The proceedings of the last month with respect to the Royal Titles Bill have been tainted with hypocrisy from beginning to end. Everybody is perfectly well aware that this Bill was introduced to gratify a personal wish of the Sovereign. That wish may have arisen from a kindly solicitude to mark the Queen's sense of the friendly reception of her son by some of the great native princes in India, or it may have been prompted by difficulties alleged to exist in domestic ceremony and family etiquette. We do not exercise ourselves in these high matters. We would only say in passing that the Queen can hardly be blamed for supposing that a personal wish for what seemed no more than a trifling personal deprecation would be respected and gratified. How is the Queen to know that the boundless loyalty about which the newspapers are never wearied of raving is not to be taken seriously? If she opens parliament, or visits a hospital, or does any other work of duty or supererogation, she reads the next day in half the journals in the country that she has been received with the fervent acclamations of vast crowds, that English subjects never loved a sovereign so devotedly in all our history, that we cherish the monarchy as the saving keystone of the social arch, and so forth, through the whole gamut of fulsome homage. If a member of her family goes to a provincial town to open a public hall, or at a public lunch, the same unmanly chorus rises and swells and sinks away. How can the Sovereign know that all this is mere words, the mechanical adulation of the *claque*? It ought not to be impossible for mayors to receive royal personages, and for able editors to report and comment upon their doings, with perfect respect and even gratification, yet in a manly, sensible, self-respecting way.

The feeling of the country is perfectly plain. There are the people of the Court Circular, who may be credited with an honest Oriental delight in self-prostration. There are the great aristocracy, who look on the crown much as the Venetian senate looked on the Doge. It is an appendage of their own system, and a token of security for their position, but still always to be kept strictly in its place. Then there is a base little multitude among the new rich, who would probably barter away every political right they have if that would procure them some trifle of recognition, some wretched bauble, from the fountain of honour. The bulk of the middle class have a friendly, but not in the least degree enthusiastic feeling, about the throne; they are glad that it is respectable and clear of scandal,—and this, it seems, is too rare a trait in monarchy not to be cherished and greatly expatiated upon. The women of the middle class, being excluded from public interests of a real kind, and with no better field for their imaginations than a rather dreary and narrow faith, have a sort of superficial attachment to the person of the

sovereign. Most of the clergy, for the same reasons, profess the same sentiment. The common people, that is to say the bulk of the nation, are fond of pageant, and if they do not see a prince too frequently, will cheer him as readily as any one else associated with a pageant, but not more readily. There is no envy in an English crowd, nor is there fetish-worship; only a natural curiosity. Those whose lives are very hard are ever curious to see the representatives of luxury and splendour, as if they were beings from another sphere. As to the institution of monarchy, they are not hostile to it; they are indifferent. The lustre and antique renown of our throne, of which so much has been said lately, is to them naught. They have no defined desire for a republic, though it is worth noticing that any reference to the stout republican effort in France is sure to be received with enthusiasm in any great public meeting in England. Friendly respect and good-will seem to us to be the terms that most truly describe the prevailing feeling about the Queen.

This is a very different thing from true imaginative loyalty, and a very different thing from that abject sentiment which makes the newspapers unreadable by self-respecting Englishmen when such an event takes place for instance as the Thanksgiving of February, 1872. The Queen, however, must naturally be the last person in the country to find out that the language of "municipal sycophants," to borrow Mr. Anderson's wholesome description, and of rotund leading articles, is mere moonshine. If all that the *claqueurs* said was sincere, the Queen might well suppose that there could be little reason why she should not add an ornament to the crown; and yet the high personage who is the object of all these professions no sooner seeks to put a little more gilding on the state coach, than she finds that she was only treated to a Grand Lama's adoration on condition of imitating a Grand Lama's nullity, and existing without will.

The first announcement that the Queen was about to take a new title was received with moderate satisfaction. The general feeling was that of Mazarin, when young Lewis XIV. objected to call Oliver Cromwell by the usual style of sovereign rulers. "Shall I call such a fellow my *brother*?" "Aye," said Mazarin, "call him your *father*, if need be, if you would get from him what you desire." If the Sovereign sought an Indian title, why not? The public on the whole was rather gratified at the titular recognition of our vast responsibilities in India. This assent was due to carelessness. People had not realised that sycophants would be likely to transform the customary titles into the phrases of imperialism. The Minister's arts began at the beginning. He talked of prerogative and wished to conceal the proposed title. To take a leap in the dark of this kind was too much to be borne even by the present House. Then he proceeded to invent reasons why it was desirable that the imperial title should be assumed. The princes of India wished it and the people of India would rejoice in it. When asked to give evidence of this, he refused. Everybody knows that there is no such evidence, and there can be no such evidence. Everybody knows that the alleged reason is fictitious. Various other shifts came next, such as the assertion that the crown would receive new splendour; followed by the assertion shortly after that the Queen is never on any account, either herself or her family, to be allowed by her ministers to use the title of

Empress or any of its appurtenances in England. Then came reasons which Mr. Lowe energetically qualified as "miserable frivolity and drivelling," and which it would be humiliating to reproduce. And finally, Mr. Disraeli intrepidly declared that the real reason was a desire to warn Russia that her advances in Central Asia towards our Indian frontier had at length put us on our mettle, and that we should give that power the effective warning that was needed, and stimulate the loyalty and confidence of our Indian fellow-subjects, by conferring a title on the Sovereign, which will be translated by the same word as that which translates her present title. We could wish that Mr. Lowe or Mr. Cowen had found in their hearts to describe this audacious statement by its plain name. If, as for some reasons seems probable, the Government is going to lend an ear to the ideas of the Bombay school as to the North West Frontier—and on these we pronounce no opinion—they are certainly not the men to suppose that that stern problem will be solved by any legerdmain of styles and titles and ceremonial proclamations. If the Russian advance unsettles India, and stirs a ferment in bazaars and villages—and there are too many good grounds for fearing that this must be the case—no man on earth can believe that the disturbance of feeling will be appeased by the mummeries of the herald and the court usher. Of course Mr. Disraeli does not believe it. The history of the Royal Titles Bill has been a series of mockeries from beginning to end. What men of honour and integrity do Lord Palmerston and Lord Russell seem! No worse degradation of the character of parliament has ever taken place. The title itself is a matter of secondary importance, compared with the hypocrisies that have accompanied its assumption. Certainly those persons—and they are not wanting—who would be glad to see England free of the social demoralisations which are inevitably bound up with a hereditary monarchy that has survived into an industrial society, can find nothing to regret in what has happened. Apart from whatever effect it may have had in diminishing the personal popularity of the Sovereign—a point on which we do not care to dwell—it has left an ill-sounding word among the old titles, like the fly in the apothecary's pot of ointment; and it has set an example of unsettlement and resettlement of title, which may perhaps set men thinking in the days of one of our future Emperors. If posterity has improved as perfectibilitarians hope, Mr. Disraeli's memory will scarcely be of the kind to make a diadem of his conferring sacred.

Meanwhile, the public sentiment on the new title is not in the least vehement. The original careless approval has been succeeded by a mild irritation. But outside of Pall Mall and some of the London newspaper offices, there is nothing like that indignation which it is convenient to manufacture at Westminster for party purposes. The title is in any case a trifle, compared with the demoralisation of public character; and even the extreme Liberal may deplore the sight of a great body of men, who in private life are the souls of uprightness and truth, greeting with 'loud and protracted cheers' arguments which they must know to be neither more nor less than mendacious.

The same feeling is moved by the futile policy of the government as to the Churchyards (Mar. 8). Here again the matter has marks of dissimula-

tion. Liberals want the question of the churchyards settled for two reasons. In the first place, the proper settlement of that question will be a sign of the moderation, reasonableness, and good sense of the ecclesiastical party, and the more of these qualities is spread over the country, the better is the prospect for those who have good and reasonable causes in hand. The partisans of disestablishment, for instance, can desire nothing so much as that the ecclesiastical party should show an honest and candid spirit in the smaller things, as that will be the best pledge for right conduct when the time comes for the greater things. Another ground for wishing the Burials Bill out of the way is that it impedes progress towards a much more important Bill. It allows too many members of parliament and too many aspirants for parliament to keep a great reputation for love of religious equality at a very cheap price. It is time that such persons should be pressed to consider the full extension of the principle of religious equality, and not allowed to escape on some partial application of it. Meanwhile, no doubt, that principle must be brought forward in its reference to minor questions, such as the Churchyards or the Schools. The discussion that takes place on the minor questions serves to educate opinion, and opens a way in men's minds to the full doctrine. The attitude of the ecclesiastical party in this poor matter is a more effective answer than any Liberal could have devised to the amiable school of the Comprehensionists. And it is unfortunately difficult to respect our opponents as we could wish, when one thinks of them submitting to be led to their little victory by a leader who says it is a sanitary and not an ecclesiastical question. This, however, is only another illustration of the hypocrisy of the present parliamentary parties.

The Home Rule section enables us to furnish one more example of the same vice. The proceedings in connection with the Municipal Franchise (Ireland) Bill are a practical demonstration of the utter hollowness of the current assertions of the readiness of English parties to concede equal rights and privileges to the sister kingdom. The Home Rulers are bent on proving that the existence of the Union in its present form perpetuates distinctions between the two countries, to the injury of popular self-government in the smaller island. The Municipal Franchise Bill was promoted by the whole strength of the party which, we must always remember, undoubtedly represents the wishes and aspirations of the great majority of the people of Ireland. Its object is to assimilate the municipal government of the two countries. It affects only the internal arrangements of Irish local affairs: it does not even indirectly threaten the continued subsistence of Imperial relations. On the contrary, nothing would be more likely to weaken the demand for separation, and to fuse the interests of the two nations, than a frank concession of the demand for identity of institutions. Yet the claim is resisted by those who denounce Home Rule as an artificial and factious remedy for an imaginary grievance; and the Irish people are told that English statesmanship will deny what Irish folly ignorantly asks for. It would be wiser to assume, if we are really anxious to cement the union, that the Irish people are the most fitting judges of what is best for them, especially when they do us the honour to base their request on our experience and example.

The *Times* newspaper seized the occasion for one of these silly attacks upon our municipal institutions by which it strives to force on public attention its favourite device of the Cumulative vote. The *Times* is still a great political power in this country, but it will seriously strain its influence, if, in order to push a particular manipulation of voting power it thinks it necessary to parade a cynical contempt for the local government which has played so large a part in the education of the English people, and has enlisted the active cooperation and sympathy of disinterested citizens of all classes in every city and borough in the country. The writer of the article on the debate on the Irish Municipal franchise, speaking probably from some small acquaintance with the parochial government of the metropolis, which is under the administration of innumerable vestries, and is denied the privileges conceded to many a small provincial town, says of our municipal government generally that "it is commonly ignorant, frequently selfish, occasionally corrupt." No statement could be more misleading or more unfair. The members of our reformed corporations are as well informed about the subjects of their administration, more unselfish and less corrupt, than the House of Commons itself. When the *Times* goes on to say that the "great defect of our municipal institutions is that those who contribute the smallest proportion of local taxation should be able to extinguish the representation of the rest," it merely repeats, with the substitution of one word, the argument of those who opposed the Reform Bill of 1832, and every subsequent effort to enlarge the basis of the suffrage. And this alleged and unproved defect would certainly not be remedied by the Cumulative vote, unless in those exceptional instances where a miscalculation in the probable result of this arithmetical device has given for a time the representation into the hands of a minority of the electors.

Nor does our present experience give the least ground for saying that the Cumulative vote would improve the character of the representation. School Boards are not on the average more enlightened or more honourable than Town Councils. In some cases the novelty of their work, and the fact that ministers of religion and women are eligible, have attracted some now, but not necessarily better qualified elements, and introduced them to public life. It is observable, however, that many have already fallen out of the ranks, and their places are being refilled from the ordinary constituents of the local authorities. On the other hand, the introduction into Town Councils of any system of minority representation would largely increase the obstructive power of certain anti-social sections of the community—as the publicans and the owners of small house property. The true remedy, as we said last month, for any real or apparent defects in our municipal government is not the cumulative vote, but cumulative functions, though for that matter neither of them necessarily excludes the other.

A very serious increase has been announced in the expense of the army, but parliament has not given to the subject any of the attention that was promised at the beginning of the session. Such discussion as took place was entirely hollow. Both parties have a distinct presentiment that neither the extra twopence per day, nor any other augmentation of pay such as parliament would consent to, is at all likely to give us the number and quality

of men that are wanted. But neither party is prepared to face the risk of any steps tending to the substitution of a national for a standing army. The Conservative classes are from all their sentiments and traditions hostile to a reduction of the professional armed force, and they are hostile to that transfer of all power to popular hands which would be the result of substituting a national training. Of the Liberals, many are still in the bonds of the old delusion that Great Britain will never again be at war, and that if she is at war, invasion is impossible. Others are too acute not to see the insecurity of both of these propositions, but they lack the courage to admit to their minds the only practicable conclusion. No doubt a certain amount of courage is needed to urge upon a constituency such a proposal for a national training to arms as was set out by Sir Henry Havelock in the last number of this Review. The demonstration against the most wholesome drill enforced in the London Board Schools was a significant symptom of the popular dislike of compulsory military training, even in its most rudimentary and harmless form. The feeling of the Volunteer movement, however, ought not to be forgotten on the other side. Meantime, it cannot be too constantly repeated that the people of Great Britain are living on like a merchant who refuses to insure. The military experts know this, and so do many men of high political authority. They can only hope that the deluge will not come till they are gone.

We have spoken of American corruption, and the financial scandals of which their newspapers bring us fresh details every day. At any rate, the partisans of despotism cannot be allowed to find any argument in this. In absolute governments, like Russia, for instance, administrative corruption is still more common. Only the control of public opinion is less vigilant, and the press less free; consequently, abuses go unperceived, at least by foreigners like ourselves. But for all that, it must be confessed that when corruption invades the highest spheres of administration, whether in America or elsewhere, we are bound to seek the cause of so grave and distressing a malady.

Montesquieu, repeating the ideas of old writers, says that virtue is the base of a republic, as honour is the base of a monarchy. At first this seems a hard saying. Virtue, one thinks, is necessary under all forms of government, but why more necessary to a republic than to a monarchy? We perceive the difference if we look at what is happening in the United States. In a monarchy, high functions belong ordinarily to men who are wealthy, who have great consideration, and who are protected against temptation by their desire not to lose caste, in other words by honour. In a republic, popular election brings to the front persons of humble origin, of no resources, and eager to get on in the world. So long as simplicity of manner and severity of principles prevail in the country, men of this kind remain honest, as until lately was the case in the United States. But when the taste for luxury and costly pleasure begins to spread, they no longer resist the opportunity of growing rich at the expense of the state. People have mocked the old idea that only an austere life and Spartan habits are suited to the republican system, and the United States used to be expressly cited to illustrate the complete compatibility of democratic institutions with the accumulation of wealth and boundless opulence. Circumstances are showing

that the ancient philosophers were right and the modern economists wrong. We shall see it more and more clearly established that a democratic system cannot last without great equality of material conditions. If wealth accumulates in the hands of the upper classes, then two causes of destruction will threaten the republic. On one side the lower classes with votes at their disposal, will be inclined to strike those above them, by throwing all the social burdens upon them. On the other side, the small men finding themselves in office, and their covetousness aroused by the examples of prodigality in the opulent classes, will insist on living in the same style. Then if at the same time religion and morality have lost their influence, what will be left to arrest the decline? The community will be pillaged and justice put up to auction. This is the very picture that New York has presented for some years, and the outlines of the same spectacle are becoming fatally visible in the Federal Government. Everywhere equality is excellent. In a democratic republic it is indispensable.

The recent events in France deserve the closest attention. A political problem is at issue of the very highest importance both for England and for all the continental nations. Will they succeed in definitely founding the republic in a great country that has for centuries been accustomed to monarchy? "But," the French republicans will answer, "the question is settled once for all. Behold the Chamber of Deputies. We are 330; 92 Bonapartists, 58 Orleanists, 86 Legitimists; in all, no more than 186 monarchists. We have thus a majority of two-thirds, and we have the same in the Senate. We are therefore the masters; we shall not only uphold republican institutions, we shall have a republican government as well." The moment when everybody says that the Republic is definitely established is the most opportune possible for asking whether it will last. The monarchists have brought it into existence without intending it; the republicans may slay it without knowing it.

M. Guizot who destroyed the monarchy in dread of a republic, still confessed that the republic which he dreaded was the noblest form of government. If, as the constitutions of free countries proclaim, all powers emanate from the nation, then logically he who exercises executive power ought also to be chosen by the nation. The hereditary and irresponsible qualities of the crown, by placing it above the national will, are evidently an inconsistency in a country of self-government. The more enlightened the citizens become, and the more conscious of their rights, the more firmly will they insist on conducting public affairs either by themselves or by delegates of their own selection; the less readily will they allow these powers to fall into the hands of a monarch acting independently of them. The republican system seems therefore to be the ideal towards which all nations are moving at a more or less rapid rate.

We must, however, confess that history does not by any means corroborate these anticipations. We have seen a number of republics transform themselves into monarchies; there is no example of a great monarchy succeeding in transforming itself and continuing to exist as a republic. In the middle ages from the north to the south Europe was full of republics. Only Switzerland remains. Two great nations, France and England, have

attempted with heroic efforts to found the republic. Both have failed, and France has failed twice. The great Polish republic was partitioned, and when Rulhière wrote his history, he thought he could find no better name for it than *The Anarchy of Poland*. Each of the great shocks that Europe has undergone has been fatal to a Republic, so delicate seems their constitution, and so little adapted to brave the storms of the modern epoch. The wars undertaken at the end of the last century to found new republics ended by killing nearly all the old ones, and the war of 1866 closed the career of the only two that still survived in Germany, Frankfort and Hamburg.

No doubt, on the other side of the Atlantic new republics have arisen, but those of Latin origin drag on an existence which is consumed by anarchy, without even the ability to settle a government strong enough to secure order. The great English Republic alone has prospered, and its development has been so wonderful that it has filled the friends of democracy with hope. It must not, however, be forgotten that the United States have enjoyed quite exceptional advantages, which we need not now enumerate. What then is the conclusion from the facts? One thing only, not that France ought to despair of founding the republic, but that the French republicans ought to be persuaded that the success of their enterprise presents enormous difficulties and demands infinite perspicacity and prudence. France is bound to remain a republic under pain of dishonour and ruin, for if the existing régime were to fall to pieces, the Empire is heir. Now what could the Empire be in the hands of a lad devoid of experience, and a woman who is ignorant, bigoted, and passionate? Two dangers may imperil the Republic: on the one side the impatience of the republicans: on the other the alarms of the Conservatives. The French in general, and especially those who style themselves children of the Revolution, are, as we all know, endowed with a spirit of excessive abstraction and misplaced logic. This spirit leads them to insist on the realisation of their ideas, without paying any heed either to the nature of things, or to the reactions they may provoke. As soon as they think they have truth and right on their side, all is to yield. "*Perish the colonies rather than a principle!*" This sums up that heroic but impracticable policy.

The pusillanimity of the Conservatives constitutes another danger. As soon as ever they miss the support of an oppressive and repressive government, they are sure that all is lost. The Red Spectre is an object of genuine dread to them, as ghosts are to little children. They dread the division of property in a country where proprietors form the majority of the nation. It was they who threw the country into the hands of Louis Napoleon in terror of the 'Partageux.' To-day the sects have made no sign. Socialism has not even shown its flag in the last elections. Communism seems dead. Still the Conservatives are afraid. The memories of the Commune,—which in truth are not very cheerful,—haunt them and make them tremble. After the Dufaure ministry, they see Gambetta; after Gambetta, Naquet; after Naquet the incendiaries of the Commune, restored by an amnesty.

These alarms are puerile, the Republicans will say. In the two Chambers the majority is republican, but of a very moderate and reasonable repub-

licanism. France has never been more tranquil, more seriously devoted to industry, less disturbed by factions. We cannot take any account of these baseless fears. But then, unhappily, these fears are a fact, and we ought always to take account of facts, however absurd they may be. Such apprehensions may have two consequences, equally vexatious. The first is this. The Conservatives are the rich, and it is the rich who maintain that trade in luxuries on which great towns live, and Paris above all. It is the confidence of the rich that keeps up prices, and it is high prices that keep industry going. The existing mechanism of exchange and industrial organization is very perfect, but at the same time very complicated, and as a consequence of being that, it is very exposed to derangement. For two years France has been reassured. Economic activity has taken a wonderful start. To inspire any disquiet as to the future is to arrest this, and then people begin to cry out: "This cannot go so. The true republic, the republic governed by republicans, kills credit, trammels industry, impoverishes the country. How much better things went under the Empire," and so forth.

The second danger which may result from these alarms is that they may take serious hold of the mind of the President. This side of the question is difficult to clear up; it is full of unknown elements, but everybody feels vaguely that there is peril. Up to what point does the President admit the practice of the constitutional system, which gives to the Chamber the right of imposing ministers on the executive power? Would he resign himself to a Gambetta ministry? It is not many months since M. Buffet declared to the Chamber that the Marshal would never lend himself to be the instrument of radicalism. The President wrote him a letter of congratulation on these words, though they undoubtedly contained the threat of a coup d'état. Now that the country has given a great majority to those whom M. Buffet called the Radicals, the President may have undergone a change of sentiment, but he may also believe in a social danger only to be conjured away by his own hand. A piquant saying is attributed to him, which he probably never uttered, but which perhaps conveys his impressions:—"J'ai dit naguère: J'y suis, j'y reste. Aujourd'hui, j'y reste, mais je n'y suis plus." Soldiers on the Continent, at any rate, do not love and cannot love the constitutional system. The spirit of an army is different from the spirit of a parliament. In the army the chief commands, and the subaltern obeys. In parliament it is all discussion and criticism. A Chamber that obeys and does not discuss, like the Legislative Body under the first Empire, is a decoy, only serving to mask deception. An army that discusses and does not obey is a public danger. There is, therefore, necessarily, at least latent, antagonism between the army and the parliament. It is certain that the President cannot feel any sympathy either with the Senate or the Chamber, with which he is called to govern. A general accustomed to command is ill prepared to play the delicate, submissive, self-effacing part of a constitutional sovereign, on whom the majority imposes ministers and laws.

It is hardly likely that the President intends to make a coup d'état in his own favour. He has no children; he is not in a position to found a dynasty; he would therefore gain nothing by it. But exasperated by the

exigencies of the Left, alarmed at the agitations which they might provoke, he might possibly think it his duty to take energetic measures to "save the country." Already those have been found about him to give him counsels of this kind, and persons will certainly not be wanting in the future who will tell him in all good faith that this is his bounden duty. The present situation is not unlike that of 1789: the same confidence in the definite establishment of a free régime: the same danger of conflict between the two powers; but with this difference, that Lewis XVI. was a weak, vacillating, and disarmed man who could not count on the troops, whereas Macmahon is a general of great energy who would certainly succeed in raising the troops against the *bavards*.

When we think of continental affairs, we must always take account of the undeniable fact, that the constitutional system is at the mercy of the army, and only subsists by sufferance of the executive power. A Chief Magistrate invested with the chief command of the troops, always comes at last, if he is bent on it, to make himself loved by them, and from that moment he has it in his power to sweep away any parliament that may thwart him. By instinct the officers are attached to the executive power, because that power has the sword, and they have little love for those who discuss and pade down the war estimates. As for the common soldiers, unless a very powerful idea is carrying away the whole country and acting on them along with the rest, they will follow their leader. From this it follows that a parliament ought always to avoid driving the executive power into a corner.

If that be done, a coup d'état would then not be impossible, if the conservative interests were to be alarmed to such a point as to make the maintenance of the republic seem a social danger; and if at the same time the President were to be forced to countersign measures that he considered it a dishonour to approve.

The declaration of war against the Dufaure ministry by M. Gambetta's journal seems to be a mistake. It was the monarchists who made the Republic; it is the parliamentarians, and not the republicans of the eve and the republicans pure, who are best fitted to accustom France to it. The hour has hardly yet come for thinking of a Gambetta ministry. M. Gambetta will have more real power and influence in guiding his friends in the Chamber than in office, where he would find himself unable to satisfy those who had borne him thither. People have watched him conducting the electoral campaign with such skill, moderation, and clearness of judgment, that a mass of prejudice against him has already disappeared. But we have to watch what his line of conduct will be now that he is at the head of a numerous army in the Chamber. The rational policy would consist in abstaining from the overthrow of the existing ministry, and in pressing upon it all the measures proper for the consolidation of republican institutions.

It has been said that the elections to the Chamber had a very marked anti-clerical tendency, and in fact, as the clergy everywhere supported the enemies of the Republic, they have found themselves sharing the rout of their allies. The republicans are almost all of opinion that measures must be taken to arrest the progress of ultramontaniam, which has been so systematically favoured under every previous system. But what measures?

To combat the political action of the Catholic Church which according to the decisions of its infallible head, is hostile to all modern liberties, there are, it seems, two means: the first, which might be called the American system, consists in the complete separation of the Church from the State, and in ignoring the very existence of the different denominations. The second, on the contrary, consists in fortifying the action of the State on the different churches; in upholding them, on the one hand, in so far as they spread moral and religious notions among the people, and on the other hand, in reining them in, whenever they attempt to interfere in political affairs. This is the system which is now applied in Prussia, and which was followed by Lewis XIV. in the articles of 1682, and afterwards by Joseph II. in Austria, and by William in the Low Countries.

In France the separation of the Church from the State was inscribed in the programme of nearly all the republicans as well as of many moderate liberals, like Laboulaye and Pressensé. It would begin by at once suppressing the budget of worship. At present Gambetta himself declares that this is a measure to be kept for a later day; and he is probably right, for it would give rise to violent struggles and desperate resistances, which ought by all means to be avoided at the opening of a régime which is still new and exposed to many threatening hazards. It is in the field of national education that they ought to stay the encroachments of ultramontanism, for in no other field are they more dangerous. Whoever is master of education is master of the future. With the present Senate, it will probably be impossible to repeal the new law on superior instruction, detestable as it is, but they might arrest its main vice by restoring the examinations to the State professors. The mixed juries they have adopted for the purpose of conferring academic degrees are the most mischievous of all systems, as experience has shown in Belgium. Several partisans of the Wallon Law who sit in the Senate, M. Laboulaye among others, resisted this feature, and would probably help to abolish it. It may be said that the exercise of the liberal professions ought to be completely free; but if we believe that examinations are needed as guarantees of professional capacity, it is the State only that can by its representatives decide whether these guarantees are adequate. Private institutions ought to be subjected to control, and not to exercise it. Superior instruction ought to be completely reorganized on the base of the ancient universities, like those of Germany to-day and those of France in old times. It ought to be liberally endowed, so as to be on a level with the scientific institutions of other countries. Primary instruction ought to be withdrawn from the predominant influence of the clergy, and out of the hands of the *Petits Frères*, who are gradually taking the place of the lay teachers. Instruction ought to be declared free and compulsory, as M. Duruy wished to make it in the days of the Empire. The Republic cannot be solidly established nor produce good results, except by the general diffusion of knowledge.

The declaration of principles communicated to the two chambers by the Dufaure Cabinet was conceived in an excellent spirit, and has been taken well by journals of every shade, except the *République Française*. What is satisfactory in this document from the European point of view is that it is so thoroughly pacific. Gambetta himself speaks in the same sense. France

seems bent on concentrating all its activity on the difficult work of internal reconstruction. Such an attitude of public opinion is a great pledge of peace, for this among other reasons, that it takes away from Germany every pretext, and what is more important, every reason for desiring or intending war.

Perhaps M. Gambetta has made a false step in trying to effect a fusion among the various groups of the left, so as to offer a united opposition to the Cabinet. It is, however, to be said that he is strictly following the very course which would be followed by an English parliamentary leader. The French Conservatives are really acting in distinct violation of the English practice. Imagine a majority of two hundred for Disestablishment, and the Sovereign proceeding to appoint a ministry of which the most severely anti-ecclasiastical member should be, say, Mr. Forster, with Lord Cairnes and the Marquis of Salisbury for colleagues. However, as a matter of fact, and probably judiciously, the majority of the republican party has given the ministry credit for their good intentions. Provided the Cabinet displays adequate energy in purifying the administration, especially the prefects, and provided it adopts an anti-clerical policy, it will have the support of the Assembly.

In the previous Chamber the extreme republicans drew nearer to the moderates. The same took place in the country, and will go on in the present assembly. No doubt it has happened to minorities to find themselves transformed into majorities within a very short time, as was seen so often in the various assemblies of the Revolution. But at that time opinion and the current of things were as hostile to the government as to-day they are favourable to it. Need of change was as imperious then, as need of rest is now. This is why neither the Bonapartist minority nor the radical minority has a chance of arriving at a majority. Only violence and gross imprudences could strengthen Bonapartism in the country. M. Dupont White, an eminent publicist, thus sums up his optimistic views at the close of a letter addressed to the present writer: "The republican party augmented and strengthened as it is by so many monarchic auxiliaries, by so many considerable personages, might soon become what the Liberal party was under the Restoration; that is to say, serious, practical, re-assuring, capable, in short, of governing France as she needs to be governed for her own peace and that of Europe."

Romanism, that creed of concord and peace, has received a rude blow by the defeat of Don Carlos in Spain, and by the anti-clerical elections in France, but without allowing itself to feel a moment's discouragement, it strives its hardest wherever it preserves any influence to keep that privilege of persecuting dissidents which is one of its dogmas. In Spain the bishops threaten war against the government of King Alphonso, if it retains tolerance and freedom of worship. The ministry wavers. In the Tyrol, the central government had given leave to constitute protestant communes, and to erect a church destined for protestant service at Meran, where many Germans pass the winter. The diet has at once declared that its privileges are violated, and that the holy land of the Tyrol is profaned. Count Brandis even read so factious a declaration that the Emperor was forced to

close the provincial diet of the Tyrol. In Italy the ultramontane party is also making ready to descend into the arena and to present itself at the polls. But the Vatican hesitates, because it sees that the national sentiment is still too powerful to leave any chance of success to a faction whose avowed aim is to restore the temporal power and so to unmake Italy.

The Italian cabinet has announced a piece of good news to the country. For the first time the budget balances. The unpleasant situation of the treasury was the only dark spot in the serene sky of the Peninsula. If the country could obtain, as Minghetti says, a real surplus, and slightly diminish or at least redistribute the burden of taxation, Italy would find herself in a better condition than any other continental country. She has no desire to attack, and she ought no longer to fear attack herself, so long as the majority in France remains republican and anti-clerical. She might then dispense with the erection of fortresses that must be extremely useless in any case. Especially might she effect large savings in the navy. She has sold the best part of her fleet; let her abstain from replacing it. The recent discussions in England as to the value of ironclads prove that, thanks to the enormous and profound transformations in the naval material, the money devoted to them is as good as lost. All is at the mercy of a new torpedo, or a new system of ramming. Let Italy here imitate the United States, which are waiting until the great trial between armour-plating and cannon is definitively settled. Whatever Italy may do, the French navy will always be stronger than the Italian. Austria, on the other side, has not the least desire to re-occupy the Peninsula. If some day France were to invade Italy, she would do so by land. A serious attack by sea is scarcely possible, now that war is made by great masses, and Italy, when acting on the defensive disposes of the railways to effect a concentration of troops. It was possible to disembark a body of 20 or 30,000 men, when the enemy on land had no more than 100,000 for the whole force at his disposal. But by virtue of her new military organization Italy will have 700 or 800,000 men. Let her take care of this army, without raising the military estimates too high, but let her cut off all expenses on a navy and on fortresses. If besides retrenching her expenditure, she wishes to increase her resources, let her impose a heavy succession-duty, and suppress collateral successions beyond the fifth degree. A tax on successions is the least felt of all taxes, because it touches nobody when it is imposed, and only strikes at the moment when it is most easy to pay it. A Budget that would balance would be for Italy the final consecration of a solidly constituted nationality. Her enemies have always said that her finance would be her ruin. The recent announcement, if it comes to be realised, will do more than anything else to silence all anti-national intrigues.

The purchase of the railways by the State is a great economic question which engages both Germany and Italy at the same moment. In Germany their aim is strategic and political. They seek to turn the iron roads into instruments of war in the hands of the Head-Quarters Staff, and an agency of centralisation in the hands of the Empire. The railways of Alsace-Lorraine are already worked by the imperial administration; they

wish to extend the same system to the whole German network. There are on all these lines places to give away by thousands. By giving them to partisans of German unity and the central government, they form in innumerable centres, wherever there is a station, a focus of centralist propagandism. In Italy the aim is partly of the same kind. But they are also naturally anxious to withdraw from the hands of a foreign company the lines of Upper Italy which command the entrance of the kingdom.

Apart from all other economic and political arguments for and against the ownership of railways by a government, we cannot deny—whether this be good or bad—that it is an application of Socialism. The business of a railway is perhaps the most difficult of all businesses. It asks for technical, administrative, legal, financial, knowledge of the most accurate sort. Every day it is necessary to resolve the most delicate problems connected with the maintenance of the permanent way, the system of locomotives, the condition of the rolling stock, the fares and rates. The responsibility is of the gravest. If therefore the State carries on the railways with success, when it has the monopoly of them in its hands, then it is evident that it would manage even more readily and successfully coal mines, metalliferous mines, and forests; (as the Prussian government does); that it could also manufacture tobacco, sugar, wrought iron: in a word could carry on all the great industries. Germany, Belgium and Italy, are entering on this path by monopolising all the iron roads. Have the Statesmen who take the initiative in this measure foreseen, and deliberately faced its consequences, or are we to see in it a sign of the times, and a proof that, as the *Katheder-Socialisten* maintain in Germany, the part of state-intervention will go on steadily increasing, instead of diminishing into non-existence, as was so willingly believed not long ago? A grave question, which we shall not attempt to answer here.

In the East, Austria seems to have decided to act energetically to prevent foreign succour from penetrating into Herzegovina. Will this be enough to bring about the submission of the insurgents, and will they succeed in hindering Servia from taking a part in the struggle? It is to be hoped so, for the sake of avoiding further shedding of blood. Russia desires an end to the insurrection, because she is not really prepared to derive any advantage from action in this quarter. But the reforms imposed upon the Turks, if they are carried into execution, will hasten the fall of their power. What makes progressive peoples advance, kills peoples that are stationary. Credit which has fertilised western Europe is the plague of Turkey and Egypt, because it is applied to over-stimulate unproductive expenditure. The railways that the Porte has constructed at immense sacrifice, will enrich the rayahs, the Christians, the rural Slavic populations; they will place all these in direct relation with their brethren of Austria, and will contribute powerfully to fortify the sentiment of nationality. The more the subject populations become civilised, the less disposed will they be to support the yoke of the Turk. The railway is so powerful an instrument of progress that before many years it will end in the emancipation of the Balkan peninsula.

March 27, 1876.

THE
FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

No. CXIV. NEW SERIES.—JUNE 1, 1876.

THE NEW DOMESDAY BOOK.

THE blue book which furnishes the matter for this article has been long looked for, and had it been well done would have been of great value. In the discussion which must precede any thorough revision of the land laws it would have been well if we had been fully supplied with authentic and relevant facts. Unfortunately the book before us throws very scanty light on the questions which suggest themselves in dealing with the land tenure of England. Some general results of an approximate character we shall be able to glean from its pages; but we must say at the outset that from its omissions and from its careless composition its value as a means of information is comparatively small.

It would not be fair to blame altogether the Local Government Board for these deficiencies. In the first place, the scope of the inquiry delegated to them was far too limited. The origin of the return was a speech of the Earl of Derby in February, 1872. His purpose avowedly was to disprove the statements made by many, and prominently by Mr. J. S. Mill, Mr. John Bright, and Mr. Goldwin Smith, as to the small number of persons who owned the land of England, and that that number was diminishing by the absorption of small holdings through the operation of the existing laws. Mr. Bright, in a speech at Rochdale (November, 1863), had said, "With laws such as we have, which are intended to bring vast tracts of land into the possession of one man, that one man may exercise vast political power, that system is a curse to the country, and dooms the agricultural labourer I say to perpetual poverty and degradation."

We remember Mr. Goldwin Smith's account of the attempted arrest of Hampden, "and how 4,000 freeholders of Buckinghamshire rode up to protect him. Where are those 4,000 freeholders of Buckinghamshire now?" asked Mr. Goldwin Smith, and Mr. Disraeli was supposed to have made a very witty repartee when he

answered the query, "Where you would expect to find them—in the county of Bucks." We shall see from this blue book how far the answer was justified.

On many other occasions these and other prominent liberals have dealt with this question of the ownership of land, and sometimes have, no doubt, been led into making exaggerated statements as to the concentration of it in very few hands. This book will be of use in this respect, that henceforward we shall be able to tell within comparatively close limits what is the extent of great estates, and how far the land is owned by small proprietors. But the return will not do much more than this. One point in which it is very defective is in not discriminating between town and country. The Scotch landowners' return is much more satisfactory in this respect. And as to house property, the statement of owners is very deceptive; the return sets down leaseholders of more than 99 years as owners. This greatly misrepresents the value of the ground landlords' interest in many of the large towns of Lancashire and Yorkshire, where the land is let for 999 years, or on chief rent. On the other hand, we cannot doubt that many leaseholders for short terms are set down as freeholders. It would have been far more satisfactory if the towns had been returned separately from the country; and if in the towns the ground landlord and the intermediate lessees had been all set down.

But, besides the faulty and inadequate method and scope of this inquiry, we have to complain of great inaccuracy and carelessness in the compilation. This carelessness and ignorance are not surprising when we consider on whom we have to depend in the last resort for the materials. The returns have been furnished by the clerks to the poor law guardians. Of late years there has been a column in the rate book for the name of the owner; but as the owner is not rated, this column is to a certain extent surplusage, and therefore is either not filled up, or filled up at random; or an old entry of an owner is allowed to remain on, though the ownership has for some time been changed.

Again, the clerk to the guardians has to depend on the parish overseer for his information on this point. The overseer is very often a small farmer, or even a mechanic. Many of them are very ignorant, and very unwilling to take any trouble, besides having little experience in drawing up statements. The office of overseer is not one which as a rule is desired, and consequently in many parishes the ratepayers are forced to serve in rotation. Thus we have a number of new men coming into office who know and care for nothing but to get through their year's duty with the least possible trouble.

Another cause of error in the returns is that as they come from the different unions, where a landowner has land in two separate unions, he may easily appear twice over, since there does not seem to have been any comparison of the different lists in the country, but

only in the Local Government office. We are told in the introduction that upwards of 300,000 applications to clerks have been made in order to clear up this matter of double entries. Whatever may have been the number of corrections, even a casual examination of the book shows a great number of errors still apparent on the face of it, and there is reason to suspect a very great many more. To give a few instances of these errors, we find in Cheshire, Mr. William Legh, of Lyme Hall, Disley, returned as owning 1,633 acres, and next to him we find Mr. W. J. Legh, as owning 5,109 acres—these two owners being one and the same, but the probability being that the one return was made by the clerk of the Macclesfield Union, the other by the clerk to the Stockport Union. So again, in Cheshire, the Rev. T. F. Hayhurst appears as the owner of 7,353 acres. The same gentleman has been returned under the name of France, as the owner of 2,418 acres. There are two other entries of land, one of 933 acres, the other of 151 acres, which, though belonging to the same gentleman, are set down separately. These mistakes cannot of course be corrected in the London office. A local assessment committee or some such body is the only one that can be expected to get county returns corrected. A very cursory inspection of the blue book revealed several other similar cases of double entry, sometimes because as to one property the name of a dead father was kept up, and for another property the name of the son now owning it was inserted; sometimes, where the owner has a double name, in the one case the property is set down to one name, in another to another.

One source of great deception in this blue book is the way in which the ownership of glebes by the clergy is treated. Sometimes they are properly returned in italics as corporations: The Rector of A, the Vicar of B. Sometimes the clergy are set down by their names as owners, as though they were private proprietors. Sometimes the clergyman is omitted entirely from the list of proprietors, whether in his own name or in that of his church. To give one or two instances of this, we may notice that the Bishop of Carlisle is set down in Cumberland simply as the Rev. Harvey Goodwin, Rose Castle, 162 acres. The Rev. Thomas Erskine, Rector of Upton, is set down as a private landowner in Berkshire.

In Cheshire hardly any of the clergy are entered as corporations; not more than four for the whole county.

This omission of many of the clergy from the list in their corporate capacity, and the entry of them as private landowners, makes a great difference in the number of private landowners appearing in the blue book—especially when we consider that there are more than 10,000 clergy owning glebes of more than an acre, and who, therefore, should appear separately.

The column of valuation is still more deceptive than the column of acreage.

In the first place, the valuation including only the valuation for rateable purposes, there is no entry of mines, other than coal mines. Way leaves, a source of so much profit in the mining districts, do not appear, nor do rights of shooting. Again, as to collieries, the column of value merely includes the rateable value of the colliery, not the royalty paid, which may exceed or fall below the rateable value. As to houses, the framers of the report have set down in some cases the whole rateable value to the ground landlord who is only reversioner, in other cases they have omitted the ground rent altogether. Thus the value set down to the Earl of Stamford from his Lancashire property is notoriously inadequate, the whole town of Ashton-under-Lyne being his. Similarly other Lancashire proprietors, such as Lord Egerton of Tatton, Sir Humphrey de Trafford, the Earl of Wilton, and many others do not appear at all accurately, on account of the land about Manchester being let in perpetuity or for 999 years.

The recent blue book on the financial condition of the two Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, gives us an opportunity of testing the return before us in certain cases, and so inferring the value of those details which we cannot test.

The following are some of the results.

In the county of Cambridge the parallel columns below show the acreage of the college property as set forth by their own detailed returns specifying each farm, and as set forth in the landowners' blue book from the clerks to the guardians. We must remark that these college returns do not include the acreage of their house property, and, therefore, will be a little under the mark, and woodlands have not been included, because as they are commonly not rateable, the rating returns would not include them.

CAMBRIDGE COLLEGES—PROPERTY IN CAMBRIDGESHIRE.

	University Financial Returns.			Landowners' Blue Book.	
St. Peter's	2,265	+	356		1,909
Clare	2,822	+	287		2,535
Pembroke	2,087	+	17		2,060
Gonville and Caius	1,838	+	162	{ 1,514 162 }	1,676
Trinity Hall	778	+	61	"	717
Corpus Christi	1,801	+	162	"	1,639
King's	1,872	—	108		1,980
Queen's	2,409	—	59		2,488
St. Catharine's	826	—	181	{ 989 18 }	1,007
Jesus	2,332	+	95		2,237
Christ's	2,184	—	160		2,344
St. John's	3,182	+	732		2,450
Magdalene	189	+	3		186

Carried forward

University Financial Returns.				Landowners' Blue Book.	
Brought forward					
Trinity	2,336	+	467	1,869	
Emmanuel	232	+	8	224	
Downing	5,031	—	1,350	7,381	
<hr/>				<hr/>	
33,234 acres.				32,682 acres.	

Thus, after allowing for small variations, we have such instances of gross neglect as the following:—St. Catharine's is entered twice, for 18 acres and for 989 acres. Gonville and Caius is entered for 162 acres, and again as Caius for 1514. To Downing College there is an excess of land of 1,350 acres set down, giving the college more land in Cambridgeshire than it has in all England. Trinity is deficient by 467 acres, and St. John's by 732 acres.

A similar table for the Oxford colleges, in Oxfordshire, gives the following results.

OXFORD COLLEGES—PROPERTY IN OXFORDSHIRE.

University Financial Returns.				Landowners' Blue Book	
University	85	—	24	109	
Balliol	339	—	73	472	
Merton	1,303	+	8	1,295	
Exeter	1,980	—	16	1,936	
Oriel	2,125	+	229	1,896	
Queen's	2,311	+	425	1,886	
New	5,903	+	1,159	4,744	
Lincoln	992	+	121	868	
All Souls	1,180	+	4	1,176	
Magdalen	5,001	+	1,734	3,267	
B. N. C.	2,286	+	675	1,611	
C. U. C.	1,544	—	139	1,683	
Christ Church	10,596	+	5,759	4,837	
Trinity	2,300	+	1,977	323	
St. John's	3,188	+	279	2,909	
Jesus	614	+	12	602	
Wadham	672	+	563	109	
Pembroke	441	—	1	442	
Worcester	216	—	3	219	
				<hr/>	
43,076				30,384	

Here we have even a worse disproportion than before. In the case of Cambridgeshire, we may suppose that to a large extent lands have been given from one college to another, for the totals nearly balance. But in Oxfordshire, we have a very great disproportion; nearly 13,000 acres have gone astray and remain unaccounted for. Probably in many cases the land has been set down to the tenants as owners. There is strong reason to believe that this is the case with Trinity in reference to numerous copyholds for lives held of the college in the parish of Wroxton. Many of the names of the tenants of the college appear in the landowners' return as owners, and though the statements of acreage do not exactly tally, yet

probably it would turn out to be so, especially as the 323 acres set down to Trinity College in the landowners' blue book, correspond pretty nearly with the 346 acres of corporate college property held at rack rent; the 1,454 acres, which are let on beneficial lease, having most likely nearly all been credited to the occupier.¹

A few other discrepancies as to college property, culled from other counties, will suffice to show how little reliance can be placed on this new Domesday book.

In Lincolnshire the landowners' returns give 1,539 acres to Magdalen College, Oxford. The college's own return shows 2,193 acres on beneficial lease, 142 acres rack rented, 44 acres trust property, a total of 2,379 acres.

The landowners' return gives 5 acres 3 roods in Lincolnshire to Oriol College. The college itself returns no lands in Lincolnshire.

In Devonshire, King's College, Cambridge, is entered twice over in two successive lines, with different addresses; in the first instance as owning 102 acres, in the next as owning 2,677. In fact King's College has in Devonshire 3,127 acres. In the same county, Corpus Christi College, Oxford, is set down for 246 acres in the landowners' blue book. The college returns 714 acres in its own statement of college property. In Essex the landowners' blue book gives 571 acres to Brasenose College. The college returns 635 acres. The landowners' blue book gives 129 acres to Magdalen College, Oxford, in Essex. Neither Magdalen College, Oxford, nor Magdalene College, Cambridge, returns any lands in Essex.

Oriol College returns 2,569 acres in Berkshire; the landowners' blue book gives it only 1,740 acres in that county. St. John's, Oxford, has 5,551 acres in Berkshire; the landowners' blue book gives the college only 3,668 acres. University College is returned as owning 47 acres instead of 94 acres.

Merton College has 1,025 acres in Cambridgeshire, but is set down for only 108 acres.

These few figures are enough to show that this blue book has been most carelessly compiled, and that in all probability it greatly exaggerates the number of owners by setting down occupiers as owners, besides entering the same owner over and over again. Having said so much of the deceptive character of the blue book, and of the way in which it exaggerates the number of owners, let us now see how far (taking it for what it is worth) it justifies the views of those who procured its publication. And first let us examine the status of those 4,000 freeholders of Bucks, who according to the right honourable member for that county are still there. The return gives us 3,288 freeholders above an acre, owning 455,056 acres, and 6,420

(1) Henry Fox, of Newthrop, is entered as owner in Landowners' blue book for 30a. 3r. 14p. The same name is entered for the same acreage as tenant on beneficial lease from Trinity College, Oxford: other instances might be cited.

owners below an acre, owning 1,153. These last must be nearly all either owners of houses or cottages in the small towns and villages, and in no respect correspond to Hampden's yeomen, who were prepared to ride up on their own horses to defend their member. But perhaps Mr. Disraeli thinks that the 3,288 owners of 455,056 acres, that is of all the county except the 1,100 acres above mentioned, and 3,000 acres of waste, are fairly representative of the same class. Let us investigate the book a little more closely.

First of all we find that of these owners 268 are corporations, owning 23,859 acres; the principal being the University of Oxford, and 20 colleges, owning 11,177 acres; seven railway companies owning 2,087 acres; the Mercers' Company owning 1,384 acres; the Crown more than 700 acres; the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and 4 deans and chapters 1,676 acres.

Thus we have left 3,020 owners, owning 431,197 acres. Of these

2 own more than	10,000 acres	26,620
2 "	9,000 to 10,000 "	19,470
2 "	7,000 to 8,000 "	14,853
1 "	6,000 to 7,000 "	6,688
4 "	5,000 to 6,000 "	21,422
4 "	4,000 to 5,000 "	18,021
9 "	3,000 to 4,000 "	29,494
22 "	2,000 to 3,000 "	49,193
35 "	1,000 to 2,000 "	47,213
<hr/>		<hr/>
81		232,974

Thus more than half the private land of the county is owned by 81 persons, who may be considered to fall within the class of squires, great and small.

Of the remaining area, three-quarters are owned by about 517 proprietors, whose property ranges between 1,000 and 100 acres. More than four-fifths of the remaining land of the county is owned by less than 1,100 small holders, owning between 10 and 100 acres each, and it is very much straining the definition of a yeoman to include even men holding as little as 20 acres, much more those between 20 acres and ten; but even with this liberal extension of the term, we have only about 1,700 freeholders other than such as hold little more than a cottage and a field or so, instead of the 4,000 men able to take horse on an emergency, and march to the defence of their threatened liberties. Perhaps the historians have exaggerated, and there never were 4,000 substantial yeomen in Bucks. It certainly seems strange that with the much smaller population of those days, probably not more than one-third of what there is now in the county, and with the much greater quantity of waste and unenclosed land, to say nothing of the rude style of farming, there should ever have been any number of men at all approaching to 4,000 owning

horses, and free to set out from home on any public errand. Still, after making liberal allowances for exaggeration, the fact must remain which none can deny, unless pleading as advocates, that the Buckinghamshire of the middle of the seventeenth century contained a sturdy race of independent farmers who have disappeared at the present day.

Indeed, even the tenant farmers then were more independent than they are now. The custom of leasing land for lives, and renewing the lease on payment of a fine, created a substantial interest in the tenant; and though there might be a relation of dependence to the lord of the manor, which was in harmony with the much more strongly-marked social distinctions of the time, yet in substance the farmer was free and could not be disturbed in his holding. The labourer, too, though subject to severe legal disabilities, had practically considerable independence. Land was not so valuable then as now. On the wastes he could build a cottage and cultivate a garden, which became his freehold; on the common he could graze a cow. And though, no doubt, the hours of work may have been long, and the living rough, yet it is probable that in physical force and in health the peasant of those days was superior to what he is now.

We may sum up the way in which the land of Buckinghamshire is held at the present day roughly as follows:—

268 corporations, owning	23,859 acres
81 large owners of 1,000 acres and upwards .	232,974 „
517 middling owners between 1,000 and 100 acres	145,090 „
About 1,100 small owners from 10 acres to 100 acres, about	47,000 „
„ 1,350 cottagers and crofters, from 1 to 10 acres, about	5,000 „
6,430 owners of less than an acre	1,153 „
Waste	3,000 „
<hr/>	<hr/>
467,466	458,076

The census gives 467,000 acres, but in this are included the roads, churches and church-yards, unrated plantations, &c.

Thus we see that according to the blue book some 5 per cent. of the county is owned for public purposes by the State, by charities, hospitals, colleges, ecclesiastical corporations, or local bodies for the poor, the highways, schools, &c.; 50 per cent. is owned by large proprietors of the class of gentry; 42 per cent. is owned by the yeomanry, if we take that word in a very extended sense as going as low as ten acres; and of the remaining 3 per cent., about half is house property, the remainder waste or not rated.

Without going into the same detail for other counties, I give a table which I have worked out from the whole blue book, and which I believe is approximately correct, showing the distribution

of land throughout England and Wales in the different counties in estates of 1,000 acres and upwards. Of course the real number of large landowners is much less than is shown in this table, and their acreage considerably greater, since, first, each landowner appears as often as he has an estate of 1,000 acres and upwards in more than one county, and there are 351 repeated entries of owners of more than 1,000 acres for the Peerage alone. Besides, many of these large owners have other estates of less than 1,000 acres, which greatly swell the total of their acreage, and many of them are entered twice over in the same county. However, subject to all these deductions, I find the facts as gathered from the blue book, allowing for errors and neglecting small fractions, to be as follows:—

Estates over	10,000 acres	288	5,285,700 acres
„ „ 9,000 to 10,000 „	52	492,700 „	
„ „ 8,000 to 9,000 „	76	534,700 „	
„ „ 7,000 to 8,000 „	88	656,100 „	
„ „ 6,000 to 7,000 „	118	768,200 „	
„ „ 5,000 to 6,000 „	204	1,106,000 „	
„ „ 4,000 to 5,000 „	239	1,067,500 „	
„ „ 3,000 to 4,000 „	524	1,818,700 „	
„ „ 2,000 to 3,000 „	951	2,299,600 „	
„ „ 1,000 to 2,000 „	2,432	3,469,000 „	
		<hr/>	
		4,972	17,498,200

These estates are those of private proprietors only, and exclude all corporate or public property, or railways. Thus we see that a body which, allowing for double entries, does not probably exceed 4,500, owns more than half England. It must be remembered that the waste lands, which are set down at 1,524,264 acres, nearly all belong to lords of manors and large owners, who derive considerable profit from them from mines, rights of shooting, &c.; and, again, the plantations, which do not appear as a rule in these returns, amount to 1,450,000 acres in England and Wales, and are principally owned by large landowners or by the Crown.

However, without bringing these lands into consideration, we have this fact that, at least 17,500,000 acres of cultivated and rateable land of England, or 53 per cent., out of a total rateable area of 33,000,000 acres belongs to some 4,500 gentry.

The *Spectator*, in one of its interesting articles on this blue book, states that 43,000 owners own more than 100 acres. This would give us about 38,000 owners between 1,000 acres and 100. These, however, would include a good many corporations. I find in the first volume that there are 228 entries of railways owning 55,272 acres, of the rateable value of £3,143,170; doubling this for all England and Wales we should have about 450 entries of railways with rather

more than 110,000 acres and £6,000,000 rateable value. There are 149 entries in the two volumes of bishops, deans, and chapters, having a total of 90,000 acres, valued at £157,674 a year. The ecclesiastical commissioners are returned as owning 149,763 acres, worth £309,400, and figure in 50 counties. We shall probably be safe in assuming that throughout England 5 per cent. of the rated land is owned by corporations and public bodies, numbering 8 per cent. of all the owners of an acre and upwards, excluding those parish clergy who are entered as private owners.

The owners below one acre, 703,289 in number, have 149,102 acres, valued at £29,020,000, clearly showing that their holdings must be almost entirely house property; and probably nearly all these holdings are in the towns and villages, principally in the former. On the whole a considerable number of calculations lead to the following approximate results for all England. More than half is owned by private owners of 1,000 acres and upwards, about two-fifths is owned by middling owners from 100 to 1,000 acres, and only a tenth by owners of less than 100 acres.

But though the gentry own so large a portion of the soil of England, they by no means represent anything like one half of the value or income derived from real property. The total gross value of land, houses, railways, &c., was about £130,000,000 a year; from this we may deduct £30,000,000 for London and for tithes, and we have in round numbers £100,000,000, the value given in the return we are examining. But of this £29,000,000 is the value of house property held by owners of less than an acre; £6,000,000 is the value of the railways; there is a great deal to be set down to buildings covering more than an acre, such as large factories and workshops, and to collieries, iron works, &c., where much of the value belongs to the lessees. On the whole it is doubtful whether the 17,500,000 of land set down to the upper class of England yields £25,000,000 a year. No doubt there are other conspicuous sources of wealth to some of them; there are such great London estates as those of the Dukes of Westminster, Portland, and Bedford; there are the revenues derived from minerals, as in Lancashire by the Duke of Buccleuch, who only figures in this blue book for 370 acres and £450 a year in that county, or in Yorkshire by the Earl of Zetland who receives many thousands a year from the Cleveland ironstone which are unnoticed in the return. But though certain large properties strike the imagination, and though rumour is apt to magnify the wealth of rich men, yet it is most unlikely that from all these other sources, including invested personalty, the landed aristocracy and gentry have an additional income of more than £10,000,000 a year. When we compare this income of some £35,000,000 a year at the outside, with the wealth derived from real

property alone, to say nothing of the immense profits made yearly from trade, we see that in reality the dominant class of England does not owe its supremacy to its wealth, great and secure as that is, but to its prestige. It is the special attractiveness and honour and political importance that have been attached to the ownership of land which give the owners of large estates their influence. No doubt the ownership of large masses of the soil enables the possessors to force the industry of the nation to pay a heavy toll whenever it is sought to effect some great national improvement; the corporations of our great towns can most of them tell a tale of how the rates have been swollen by the heavy price they have had to pay to landowners for their water supply, for their drainage, for the disposal of their sewage; and the great railway companies, if they published the secret history of their negotiations with landowners, might make many an owner of an historic name and great estate blush at the revelations of the sources of some of his wealth. Occasionally a case has leaked out into publicity by the action of the law courts, but as a rule the knowledge of the prices paid to buy off opposition has gone no further than the gossip of railway directors and parliamentary agents, and of neighbouring squires who sighed that no corner of their land had been touched by the new railroad.

The power of the House of Lords is strikingly illustrated by this blue book. When we see the extent of their possessions we cannot wonder (especially when their territorial influence is coupled with the seductions of a title) that they should wield so much power even in these days of the ballot and of household suffrage.

The list of their possessions begins with estates of 191,000 acres, of 138,000 acres, and 108,000 acres, followed by 87,500 acres, 78,500 acres, 70,000 acres, 68,000 acres, 66,000 acres, and 61,000 acres.

There are nine peers having property between 50,000 and 60,000 acres, holding together 490,000 acres; five between 40,000 and 50,000, holding 216,000 acres; 23 between 30,000 and 40,000, owning 770,000 acres; 45 peers have estates between 20,000 and 30,000 acres, making an aggregate of 1,087,000 acres. From 20,000 to 15,000 acres there are 34 peers, and their estates amount to 564,000 acres. From 15,000 to 10,000 acres, there are 55 peers, and they own 674,000 acres; 72 peers own between 10,000 and 5,000 acres, in all 523,000 acres; and 81 peers own from 5,000 to 1,000 acres apiece, and together 230,000 acres. Thus 333 peers or peeresses own 5,422,000 acres, or one-sixth of the land of England.

This blue book does not show the position of those lands, nor set forth how great the political influence which they secure to their

possessors. But when we remember that it is from these great peers that the lords-lieutenant are chosen, on whom depends the nomination of county magistrates, when we remember the amount of patronage which they exercise outside of their own estates, the respect which their position insures in their own locality, we cannot be surprised at the immense political strength concentrated in the upper class; for 20,000 acres and £30,000 a year, when owned by a man of title, mean much more social prestige than the same property owned by a commoner, and infinitely more than three times the income made in trade, though, the manufacturer who makes £100,000 a year may be employing and paying wages to more than the whole population on all the estates of the peer. And in estimating the power of the English aristocracy and gentry we must not forget what a potent auxiliary they have in the Church. In the first place, a very large amount of the patronage of the Church is in their hands; 1,351 livings are in their gift; and it is generally the large well-paid livings in country parishes with small populations, of which they have the disposal. They appoint their sons and brothers and relations, or if these are all provided for, then their personal friends and dependants; and the clergy, even if they were not prone as a profession to take a conservative view of things, have a very strong inducement in that direction on account of the way in which the mass of Church patronage is held in this country; and the bishops, promoted as they are by the prime ministers, are apt to fall into the same conservative groove, and they have the disposal of 2,029 livings, besides canonries and archdeaconries. What wonder, then, if the Established Church is found, with very few exceptions, throwing its weight in favour of the territorial party? And let it not be said that the territorial party is divided into Liberals and Conservatives. On mere political questions they may be divided, though even as to these the great mass of the class is conservative; but when we come to social questions—to matters in which the landowners' interest clashes with the general welfare—we become aware that class feeling is stronger to unite than political differences are to divide, as witness the legislation of eight years ago on the cattle plague, witness all questions connected with the taxation of land, or its settlement and inheritance. The system of primogeniture, of entail, and of settlement is kept up against the feeling of the mass of the middle and poorer classes of this country by the sentiment and family interest of those owners of estates of 1,000 acres and upwards, whose acreage is one-half, but whose interest as to the value of their property is not more than a quarter, of the whole income arising from real estate in the country. The agriculturists for years have demanded the same right of self-government and administration of local affairs that is enjoyed by the towns; but

the irresponsible oligarchy of Quarter Sessions goes on, because of the great political power of the gentry. If a borough wishes to have a court of Quarter Sessions it must pay for a recorder, who is nominated, like most other judges, by the Crown. Should the borough magistrates propose to sit themselves and try criminals at Quarter Sessions, such a proposal to introduce amateur justice would be scouted on all hands; but this same amateur administration of justice goes on in the county Quarter Sessions, with one or two exceptions, throughout England, and no one raises his voice in criticism. Nay, more, the chairman, who is elected by his brother magistrates to preside, is generally chosen from political motives; and no matter how good a lawyer a magistrate may be, no matter how diligent in discharging his duties, we may see him passed over, and we have seen such a man passed over, because the majority of the justices would not recognise merit in a political adversary.

And let no one suppose that the administration of the law by county justices has no bearing on the political importance of their class. Take one instance alone, and consider the immense power wielded by the justices in the granting of licenses to public-houses. Again, in the matter of music halls and places of entertainment, and in many other instances where licenses are required to carry on some trade, the good-will of the magistrates is all important, and the inhabitants of the country live in daily dread of incurring their displeasure. Again, these same justices in Quarter Sessions have the regulation of the rating of the county, and we know the scandal and bitter discontent that have been occasioned in many counties by the great disparity between the rated value of the great manor-house and that of the semi-detached villa of the retired tradesman. But we need not give detailed instances to show how the class of large landowners governs the country. In parliament and in their own districts their influence is paramount. The commercial classes have been able to secure free trade, and can obtain such special legislation as they need for their industrial purposes, but in general matters the landowners still govern the country.

Having given a general idea of the way in which land is held in England we must notice the Scotch returns. Of course it is not fair to lay the same stress on the size of estates there as in England, for a great deal of the land being waste and moor land must be held in large tracts to be made profitable for sheep farming; but after making all allowance for the barren character of a great part of Scotland, even so, the immense tracts that own the sway of one man are so inordinately large as seriously to injure the welfare of the country.

The following table gives the distribution of land in Scotland:—

		Acres.
Duke and Duchess of Sutherland	1 . .	1,326,000
Duke of Buccleuch	1 . .	431,000
Sir James Mattheson	1 . .	424,000
Earl of Breadalbane	1 . .	373,000
Earl of Seafield	1 . .	306,000
Duke of Richmond	1 . .	269,000
Earl of Fife	1 . .	259,000
Mr. Matheson	1 . .	220,000
Duke of Athole	1 . .	195,000
Duke of Argyll	1 . .	174,000
Sir K. Mackenzie	1 . .	165,000
Sir G. Ross	1 . .	165,000
Lord Lovat	1 . .	162,000
Duke of Hamilton	1 . .	151,000
McLeod	1 . .	142,000
Baily	1 . .	141,000
Earl of Dalhousie	1 . .	138,000
Lord Macdonald	1 . .	130,000
Cameron of Lochiel	1 . .	126,000
Macintosh	1 . .	124,000
Above 100,000 acres .	8 . .	836,000
From 100,000 to 50,000 . . .	38 . .	2,504,000
„ 50,000 to 10,000 . . .	264 . .	4,424,000
„ 10,000 to 9,000 . . .	24 . .	224,600
„ 9,000 to 8,000 . . .	37 . .	311,600
„ 8,000 to 7,000 . . .	43 . .	316,400
„ 7,000 to 6,000 . . .	59 . .	373,200
„ 6,000 to 5,000 . . .	76 . .	410,500
„ 5,000 to 4,000 . . .	119 . .	523,500
„ 4,000 to 3,000 . . .	152 . .	477,500
„ 3,000 to 2,000 . . .	290 . .	710,700
„ 2,000 to 1,000 . . .	553 . .	791,000
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	1,683	17,324,000

The whole acreage of Scotland is returned in the Scotch land-owners' blue book as being 18,946,694 acres. Thus it results that more than nine-tenths of Scotland belong to less than 1,700 owners, and that half Scotland belongs to about seventy owners.

The blue book gives a total of 131,530 owners, but of these, 111,658 own less than an acre apiece, 35,000 being owners in towns of 20,000 inhabitants and upwards; there are less than 20,000 owners of an acre and upwards, of whom 1,316 are owners of land in the large towns.

And let it not be said that these large estates do no harm. For one thing the existence of these properties has made possible the creation of the great deer forests, which now occupy so large a portion of Scotland. We have no return of their acreage, but we shall probably be greatly within the mark if we say that 2,000,000 acres of land have been cleared of sheep and the valleys depopulated to

make room for deer. At 3 acres to a sheep, this means that some 700,000 sheep might be kept in Scotland, adding to the food supply of the country, and furnishing other valuable products, instead of which we have a few deer killed, and a number of gamekeepers, watchers, and gillies withdrawn from productive employments, to minister to the vulgar luxury of a few wealthy sportsmen. No doubt the Scotch lairds who let their land at a high rent, approve of the change, but it does not follow that the system of deer forests is good for the country. There is a transfer of wealth from the millionaire to the landlord, but the productiveness of the country is diminished, and though a great revenue is derived from the game rents, the State is defrauded, for these game rents are not valued for succession duty. Meantime, the small farmers who still exist in Highland glens find their oats trampled and devoured by the deer, who come down by night and browse and roll in their crops, and in winter they come even lower down and scrape up the potatoes, and make inroads on the food reserved for the stock of the farmers. A deer forest is not only a patch of barbarism in the midst of the country, but it inflicts injury beyond its bounds. Then the loneliness and quiet required for such a place leads landowners to obstruct and close existing rights of way. Anyone who has travelled about Scotland, knows how many paths formerly regularly used by shepherds, and much travelled over, are now being wrested from the public, who are not prepared to face the violence of gamekeepers who dispute their legal rights and drive them back from the hill. A sport which claims to shut up from public access miles of wild moor land where no possible injury can be done by men, stands condemned by that claim alone; especially at the present day, when the rage for enclosure, and the grasping at our commons, leaves so few spots of wild nature for us to seek refreshment in from the smoke and hideousness of modern industrial life.

The taste for the ownership of land is a natural one and a healthy one. The territorial democracy of which Mr. Disraeli once spoke is the backbone and strength of the United States. But there is a wide difference between the enjoyment of a Sabine fame, such as Horace delighted in, or the lordship of one lizard which Juvenal longed for, and those *latifundia* which ruined Italy and caused the fall of the Roman Empire. The great estates in flying over which a hawk would grow weary, the rhetorical image of the Roman poet, are almost realised at the present day within the narrow limits of this little island. Tracts which would be over wide if planted in the boundless prairies of the West, cramp and jostle us among the factories and workshops of our great industrial populations. Close by the courts and alleys of our crowded towns we see mile upon mile of park palings which enclose some rural paradise of wood and water, of glade and thorny thicket,

of fern and smooth turf lawns. The two seem designed to supplement each other. But the mechanic as he tramps along the dusty road passes by locked lodges and suspicious gamekeepers, who warn him that there is no pleasure for him within the walls. That trespassers will be prosecuted with the utmost rigour of the law, is the notice that stares him in the face. The great park is reserved for the solitary owner and for the game. It was said of our English nobility and their great dreary parks, "*Solitudinem faciunt, placem appellat.*" Is it desirable to keep up by artificial legislation these great estates which minister to pomp and to political importance, but not to real happiness? When a landowner has so much land that he does not know, as he goes over it, whether it belongs to him or to another; when his tenants know nothing of him, but through the estate agent and solicitor, how is he the better for this dominion? No doubt the power to return himself or his son for the county ministers to his political importance. He can out of these vast domains secure a peerage or a rise in the peerage or a blue, or a red, or a green ribbon. But after all, these objects of ambition are in themselves artificial, the result of a diseased state of society in which, where luxury is gratified to the full, imaginary wants have to be invented to furnish some further object of hope, lest life should pall from satiety. And when we come lower down in the social scale, to the gentry of moderate estates, we find other evil results from the superstitious reverence that is paid to the quality of squire. The owner of two or three thousand acres is weighed down by his position—he has inherited with the family estate and the family mortgages, a family mansion beyond his means to keep up, and a family position which he maintains by scraping and saving, and by pinching himself and his family. Popular speech calls him the owner; but though as much is expected of him as if he were truly the owner, yet in reality he is a mere life tenant with little power and sadly hampered. The real owners among whom the income of the property is distributed are legion. There are the mortgagees, the dowager with her jointure, the brothers or sisters and their children with their charges on the land, the married son on whom he has made a settlement to induce him to re-entail the property. There are the claims of the squire's station, as imperious though not as legal as the others. Then there is the need of saving out of the scanty life income to provide for the younger children. When all these drains have been considered, how little is there left for the improvement of the property. "*Quicquid delirant reges*" may be translated freely, if the squire contests an election, or if the squire's son incurs gambling debts, it is the cottagers who must pay, in broken-down hovels, in an undrained and fever-stricken village, in a poisoned water supply fed from neighbouring cesspools. But in spite of all these

drawbacks, family pride requires that the family of Acres shall still be known as Acres of Clod Hall. The loss of dignity which would result from severance from those rushy, ill-drained, bankrupt acres, is worse than all the pinching and anxiety that are endured with their possession. And this nourishment of family pride at the expense of family feeling and of the welfare of the country, becomes a sort of religion which is inculcated upon all the children, whether the one happy eldest born, who is to transmit the family glory undimmed, or the younger ones to whom is reserved the less pleasant duty of self-sacrifice. Fortunately at the present day the younger sons have taken more boldly to various trades and professions, and we have comparatively few of those undesirable characters which figure in the plays and novels of the last century, such as the Squire's younger brother who hung about the hall, and in return for his board and lodging discharged the duties of a superior gamekeeper. The family living still often provides for one son, who, *nolens volens*, must profess a divine call to accept the position of rector with some hundreds a year. But official patronage and maintenance at the expense of the State being gone, except for the few who are highly connected, most of the younger sons of the gentry set out manfully to fight their way in life. But how does the system work on the daughters? We are astonished at the willingness of widows in India to burn in obedience to custom, but England is full of starving spinsters who have lost the chance of happy homes, because the glory of the family demanded that the money which might have enabled them to marry, should be retained to enable the son and heir to keep up his position in the country. And these faded women, many of them, do not repine. They treasure the memory of some old romance, the novel of their life, of which the third volume has been suppressed, but console themselves for the loss by feeding their family pride and keeping up a chill gentility, which would be ludicrous if it were not pathetic.

The welfare of the country demands that land should be freely bought and sold. Fully one half of the land is strictly tied up in settlement, so that it is not in the market. The tradition of family pride and social importance, which are coupled with the ownership of land, help to keep it out. When property in land no longer confers an advantage in local government there will not be the same inducement to amass great properties; land will be held by rich men in such portions as are necessary for enjoyment, not for domination or vainglory. In such a case there would gradually be few estates in the cultivated parts of the country of more than a thousand acres, and this would not work any social oppression, especially if we had better and larger units of rural self-government than the township or small parish. With a unit of self-government such as the poor

law union, and with a unit for election of representatives of not less than 1,000 inhabitants, much of the political importance of the ownership of the land of a parish would disappear, and economic considerations which tend to the distribution of land would come into play. It is desirable that even in rural districts land may be so distributed that the competition of landowners may come into play, and that in no district any one man should have a veto on the existence of places of worship or of schools. It is further desirable that land should be held by solvent people, who can improve it and do justice to it, instead of the present state of things, where many a bankrupt and broken-down family clings to a property that belongs far more to the mortgagees than to them.

It is desirable that there should be greater power for the acquisition of small freeholds, that in our villages, mechanics and others who are industrious should be able to acquire the independence resulting from the ownership of the houses in which they dwell. It is the precarious tenure of their homes, which to a great extent puts the poorer classes in the country at the mercy of the upper class.

Valuable as the old yeomanry cultivating their own land was, and much as it is to be regretted that such a class should have passed away or nearly so, it is not easy to look for the founding anew of such a class. Improved methods of agriculture, the demand for more capital per acre in the cultivation of land, the tendency to make farming a skilled and scientific occupation, and the growth of large farms, are all against a revival of the old class of yeomanry. But we may give our tenant farmers many of the characteristics of that class. Security for their capital by some reasonable tenant right, compensation for improvements, protection from the ravages of game, association in the government of the county, education for their children in reformed grammar schools, all these things will give them strength, dignity, and security, and will raise their status, and create in them some of that outspoken independence which was the boast and pride of our old yeomanry. If at the same time by the proper use of our waste lands and public lands, facilities are given to the labourers to advance their position, either by allotments or by co-operative farming, and if our rural elementary schools are made truly national and efficient, and if a proper self-governing organization be given to rural England, we may see a peaceful revolution for the better which will work wonders. As relates to the distribution of land, a few changes in the law would probably do much.

1. The separation of county administration from the ownership of land, the basing it on an elective ground, and the readjustment and extension of areas for local government.

2. The assimilation in all respects of real to personal property.

3. The prohibition of settlements of land on unborn persons, and

the incorporation of a power of sale in all settlements without requiring any consents.

4. The extension of the powers of compulsory purchase of land for many public objects.

5. The abolition of the game laws, or at least their very great restriction.

Of all the questions which demand the attention of Liberal politicians, there is none that cries more loudly for settlement than this one of the relation of the people of England to the land of England. The connection between Church and State interests a more active group of reformers, and is, therefore, discussed more frequently, but it is not in more urgent, nor in as urgent, need of reform.

Though the land laws of this country hamper its social development, though they inflict a grievous tax upon the whole nation for the benefit of a small class, though they have degraded the poor of the country, and stunted the health of our town population; yet in spite of all this, apart from some speculative Radicals of the upper or middle class, few reformers outside of the working-class leaders have sought to expose their injustice, and to bring about a remedy. Many times have Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright sought to direct attention to this matter, as one which would, if thoroughly dealt with, produce a greater harvest of good to the country than even the repeal of the corn laws; but their call has met with no response. When Mr. Mill founded the Land Tenure Reform Association, his own name and personal eminence supported it for a time; but even during his lifetime few subscribers came forward, and after his death the society collapsed.

Nevertheless, though in the present age of feverish accumulation of wealth, of craving for social distinction, of somewhat easier transition than formerly from the middle to the upper class, the temptation is very great to our successful men of business to ally themselves with the system which maintains the social supremacy of large landowners, and though consequently the natural leaders of the movement for land reform fail us, yet we cannot doubt that as education spreads among the poor, as municipal and representative institutions are extended and strengthened, we shall make the land laws of England one of the practical questions for politicians, instead of a speculative theme for economists.

E. LYULPH STANLEY.

THE FINANCIAL CRISIS IN AMERICA.

It is a humiliating reflection that the Anglo-Saxon race are unable to subsist through a whole generation without two or three times breaking into a commercial and financial stampede, in which, figuratively speaking, hundreds of thousands of people are trampled to death, or left bruised and bleeding by the way side. These disgraceful routs have latterly assumed something of the regularity of clock-work, so that people pretend to know when to expect one by looking in the almanac. 1816, 1825, 1837, 1847, 1857, 1866, 1873, each of these years has ushered in its holocaust of English victims, and the alternate periods have included America as well, so that business men take into their calculations a panic on one side of the water every ten years, and on the other side every twenty. But, notwithstanding the apparent regularity of the visitation, very few men engaged in trade escape, when the clock strikes the dreadful hour. The appearance of prosperity immediately preceding the panic is so deceitful, the activity of trade and the upward movement of prices are so exhilarating, that the tornado always finds us with every inch of canvas spread, all the ports open, and the crew fast asleep. It is impossible to exaggerate the suffering caused by these financial storms, whose vengeance always falls with greatest severity upon those least responsible for them, and least able to resist them, —the labouring poor. No one can read the story of England's poor immediately following the commercial crises of 1816 and 1825 without a shudder. Nor were those of America, after the crises of 1837 and 1857, any better provided for, except as nature had dealt rather more kindly by them. All that man could do had been done to turn them shelterless and penniless into the street, to become beggars or barbarians, like the Sunderland sailors, the Norwich weavers, and the Bradford wool-combers of the mother-country. Few persons are aware how great an obstacle to human progress these oft-recurring shocks to industry really are. We see great houses go down with a crash, but others come to take their places. We see multitudes of operatives thrown out of employment, and soup kitchens established, and charities set on foot, to carry them through the weary time of revulsion. What is not seen is the progress they might make if their savings were not swept away every few years through no fault of their own.

The people of the United States are now toiling through one of these periodical crises. During the past three years there have been mercantile failures with liabilities reaching nearly \$650,000,000. Multitudes of persons have been plunged from affluence into poverty.

Greater multitudes have been thrown out of employment altogether. Riotous demonstrations have taken place among the cotton operatives at Fall River, in the coal regions of Pennsylvania, and elsewhere, but happily without bloodshed. The New England States are pinched almost to the extremity of endurance, and the iron industry is prostrated as it has never before been in the lifetime of the writer. The West has suffered less than any other section, but the whole country is in a sad state of trouble, and is asking, When will these hard times pass away?

The phenomena antecedent to the crisis were the usual ones—a rise of prices, great prosperity, large profits, high wages and strikes for higher, crowded thoroughfares, large importations, a railway mania, expanded credits, over-trading, over-building, and high living. On the 17th of September, 1873, the New York and Oswego Midland Railway Company failed, and there was a tremor in the stock market. On the 18th the banking house of Jay Cooke and Co. closed its doors, and the depression in stocks became a panic. Prices of the leading railway and miscellaneous shares fell from 1 to 10 per cent. The usual soothing statements were put forth that the suspension would be only temporary, but the public believed otherwise. This firm had been long engaged in promoting the most hazardous and premature railway enterprise of the age, viz., the Northern Pacific, and had made advances of its own and its depositors' money to the amount of several millions. Its position was identical with that of the financial companies that collapsed in London in 1866—its capital and deposits having been lost in bad speculations. On the 19th the firm of Fisk and Hatch succumbed, together with eighteen other private banking and brokerage houses, in New York. Messrs. Fisk and Hatch had been "carrying" the Chesapeake and Ohio railway in much the same way that Cooke and Co. had been carrying the Northern Pacific, but they possessed the confidence of business men in a higher degree. There were eight failures in Philadelphia on the same day, and a "run" was commenced on the Union Trust Company of New York, one of the largest monetary establishments in the city. On the 20th the Union Trust Company closed its doors, with liabilities amounting to \$6,000,000, and it became speedily known that its secretary was a defaulter to the amount of \$128,000, and that an outside person had been allowed to make an overdraft of \$200,000 more. Subsequent investigation showed that the Union Trust Company was full of dead men's bones. Panic terror now seized Wall Street. Western Union Telegraph shares, the leading fancy in the market then, as now, fell from 90 $\frac{1}{4}$ (the price it commanded four days earlier) to 55 $\frac{1}{4}$, and New York Central Railway, the *pièce de résistance* of the Stock Exchange, from 100 to 89. The Bank of the Commonwealth and the National

Trust Company suspended, and so many stock-brokers were believed to be unable to meet their engagements that the Stock Exchange was closed by order of its officers, and remained closed ten days.

On the 22nd there was a general agreement that the worst was over, the only failure of importance being that of the Canada Southern Railway Company; but, to guard against a return of the symptoms, the aid of the Government was invoked, and an order was obtained from the President to turn the contents of the national treasury into the money market by purchasing Government bonds with Government legal-tender notes. No advantage whatever resulted from the action of the Government, for the reason that the holders of the national bonds were not generally the persons needing money, and no others could gain access to the supply in the treasury. The New York savings' banks, however, were large holders of bonds, and, apprehending a run upon themselves, they rushed headlong to get them converted into greenbacks, which they immediately put under lock and key. The savings' banks were protected against runs by a provision of law which authorises them to require thirty or sixty days' notice from depositors of an intention to draw out their money. Before the expiration of this period the panic had subsided, and the managers found that they had exchanged an interest-bearing security for another bearing no interest. They had sold their bonds at panic prices, and must buy them back at an advance, if at all; but what is to the purpose now is that the greenbacks poured out of the Government vaults went straightway into the savings' bank vaults, and produced no effect whatever on the money market. It may be added that if they had not gone into the hands of the savings' bank managers they would probably have remained in the Government vaults.

On the 23rd the bad symptoms returned. The banking-house of Henry Clews and Company suspended. This was a house that had close and somewhat questionable relations with the Government at Washington. The drain upon the New York banks for currency had now become so severe that the regular operation of the clearing-house was no longer possible; and it was determined to issue \$10,000,000 of certificates based upon bills receivable of the banks, to be used for paying balances at the clearing-house instead of legal-tender notes. These certificates were issued by a clearing-house committee, who passed judgment upon the bills receivable, and required a margin of 25 per cent. to make good any probable depreciation resulting from mercantile failures. I am not aware that this device was ever before resorted to as a means of ballasting commerce against the temporary effects of a panic. It certainly merits the attention of economists; for although it amounted, in a legal point of view, to a general bank suspension, it checked the prevailing

terror in a notable manner. Instead of a dozen or more of the weaker banks, and perhaps all of them eventually, being closed up, with the possibility of having their affairs settled through the courts of law, the stronger ones sustained the weaker; and, what is more to the point, their united action exercised a moral force on the community which effectually prevented a run, or any extreme measures to compel the immediate payment of deposits by legal proceedings.

As a corollary to this action, the banks, on the 24th, ceased paying large cheques at their counters, but certified them "good through the clearing-house." Cheques for small sums were paid as usual. Larger ones were paid, if required by manufacturers or others to pay wages to operatives. Certified cheques and clearing-house certificates fell to 1 per cent. discount, and became a marketable commodity. The total amount of clearing-house certificates rose, during the period of suspension, to \$22,000,000, from which point it gradually sank until the 1st of November, when they were all redeemed and resumption took place.

On the 25th, the Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, Cincinnati, and St. Louis banks followed the example of the New York banks, *i.e.* suspended the payment of currency on large cheques, issued clearing-house certificates for bank balances, and expostulated with their customers, instead of either paying them or closing their doors. Within a few days this policy had been adopted in nearly every town in the United States where three or more banks existed, a clearing-house being extemporised for the occasion. In Chicago a different policy was pursued. That city was very favourably situated for drawing currency from the west. The panic had come in the midst of the crop-moving season. Chicago, being the principal centre of the grain trade, was in a position to command currency in spite of the utmost efforts of eastern cities to retain and hoard it, and accordingly it began to flow thither very rapidly, first at the rate of \$1,000,000, and gradually rising to \$3,500,000 per day, to pay for grain. The principal banks of that city believed that they could respond to any run that would probably be made upon them, and refused to enter into any arrangement for paying or receiving balances from each other in clearing-house promises. There was accordingly a run in Chicago, and five banks suspended. Three of those were perfectly solvent, and soon resumed business.

On the 26th, currency attained a premium of 3 to 5 per cent. over certified bank cheques in New York, but the premium of gold over currency was declining. During all this time there was absolutely no quotable rate of interest anywhere, but time transactions in grain at Chicago showed that some traders were willing to pay at the rate of 20 per cent. per month, and that they could be accommodated at that rate. It is probable that some loans were made, even in the

height of the panic; at moderate rates of interest, as a matter of favour, or in order to protect security which would otherwise have been lost altogether; but such transactions cannot be adduced to show any such thing as a market rate for the use of money. In fact, there was no market rate.

On the 29th reports came from the manufacturing districts that employers were discharging their operatives, or putting them on half time. Several mercantile failures were announced in Philadelphia, and the Glenham Manufacturing Company, a large woollen establishment, suspended. The mere panic terror had now so far spent itself that the New York Stock Exchange ventured to reopen its doors on the 30th.

The remaining events of the forty-day period, which commenced on the 17th of September, may be briefly narrated. On the 2nd of October the premium of currency as compared with certified cheques had fallen to 1 per cent., and soon after it declined to $\frac{1}{2}$, and then to $\frac{1}{8}$, and on the 31st it disappeared entirely. Mercantile failures became more numerous, and reports of manufacturing distress multiplied. On the 10th of October a series of remarkable ups and downs in the Stock Exchange commenced, showing that large holders, who were not yet broken, were making desperate efforts to restore prices to something near the old figures. Fluctuations of 10 per cent. in a single day in some classes of securities were not uncommon. Some failures took place among these operators more important than any that had been announced in September. The banks throughout the country had generally retired their clearing-house certificates, and being no longer threatened with a run for deposits, found no difficulty in meeting all demands made upon them for currency. But the crisis was ploughing a deep furrow through the mercantile, manufacturing, and railway interests, and through all branches of speculation. There had been a fall in the prices of nearly all commodities except grain, which was sustained by an active foreign demand. On the 31st the paper of a large Rhode Island manufacturing firm, employing nearly two million spindles, went to protest. The liabilities were said to be \$14,000,000, and the assets much larger in amount, but among these assets was a most extraordinary collection of investments for cotton spinning and print works, embracing water-power in Maine, and also in South Carolina, lands in Kansas, sheet-iron works, steamships, street railways, locomotive works, saw mills, flax mills, savings banks, and race courses. This was the largest mercantile failure of the year. The price of gold (payable in greenbacks) had been quite steady at 111 to 113 before the panic. It sank slowly to $106\frac{1}{8}$ on the 7th of November (the lowest since the war), from which point it rose to $110\frac{1}{2}$ in December. That is to say, greenbacks had been worth about 90 cents to the dollar before the panic, rose to 94 during the panic,

and declined to about 90 after it. United States Five per Cent. Bonds, which stood at 114½ in July, fell to 106 in September, to 105 in October and November, and rose to 113 in December. The other classes of national securities showed about the same fluctuations.

The following table shows the mercantile failures in the United States for a period of five years and three months: ¹

Year.	Number of Failures.	Liabilities.	Average Liabilities to each Failure.
		<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>
1871	2,915	85,252,000	29,245
1872	4,069	121,056,000	29,996
1873	5,183	228,449,000	44,045
1874	5,830	155,233,000	26,627
1875	7,740	201,060,000	25,960
1876 ³	2,806	64,000,000	22,808

Railway bonds in default at the beginning of the present year amounted to \$789,367,665, of which \$535,967,665 were held in the United States, and \$253,400,000 abroad. Of this sum, \$226,425,100 were in default prior to September 20, 1873.³

The causes and antecedents of this crisis were of like nature with those of all previous financial crises, from the great tulip speculation in Holland, in 1636, down to the present time—viz., a great multiplication of debts based upon a relatively small amount of capital. Some writers have endeavoured to draw a distinction between a financial crisis and a commercial crisis. Indeed, it is doubtful whether any crisis of the kind we are considering has ever taken place anywhere without finding plenty of people, of more or less repute, to call it a financial and not a commercial crisis, implying thereby that it was a popular misunderstanding respecting money, and not a real deficiency of the means of payment. There is no room for such a distinction. The yardsticks, the scales, and the peck measures never produced any crisis, nor is it in their nature to produce one. No more is it in the nature of that other tool for facilitating the exchange of property called money. The financial crisis and the commercial crisis are two names for the same thing. What that thing is it is the aim of this article to inquire. A distinction is perfectly allowable, however, and even necessary, between a crisis produced by internal, and one produced by external, causes. The real financial crisis is the one which has wrought itself out by purely

(1) These figures are from the annual reports of the Mercantile Agency of R. G. Dun, and Co., who have on their books the names of 680,000 individuals and firms. They do not report failures of banks, brokers, real estate dealers, railway companies, or persons not engaged in mercantile business or closely allied trades.

(2) Three months.

(3) *Financial Review*, William B. Dana and Co., New-York.

commercial events. A crisis caused by political revolution, like that in France in 1848, belongs to a different category. The migration or hiding of capital to escape the apprehended dangers of communism, or invasion, or any other form of public disorder, may lead to extensive bank failures, and these may lead to mercantile failures, the whole assuming the appearance of a financial crisis, but it is not the phenomenon we are now considering.

The war of the rebellion closed in the spring of 1865, having demonstrated not merely the tenacity of the combatants on both sides, but stupendous powers of production. It is probably no exaggeration to say that the expenditure of the two sections during the four years, after making due allowance for the use of a depreciated currency, exceeded 4,000 millions of dollars gold value, or a sum equal to the whole debt of Great Britain. Of this sum, not more than one-tenth, if so much, was borrowed from abroad while the war was in progress. The capability of producing a surplus of two hundred millions sterling per year was as little suspected by the people of the United States themselves as by those of other countries; and when we consider that a million men were constantly withdrawn from productive employment—the number rising much above that at times—we cannot fail to perceive how rapid would be the increase of wealth if the labour, the natural resources, and the machinery of the country could be called into as great activity in time of peace as in war. The phenomenon of great prosperity, coincident with the waste and destruction of property by war, is easily explained when we consider how small a share of the potential energy of the people ordinarily finds employment.

The country was fairly prosperous during the four years succeeding the war, and at the expiration of this time there was much capital seeking investment in America, and still more in Europe. In 1869 the Pacific railway was opened and the country seemed to accept that event as a signal for general speculation. Prices of real estate rose in the chief cities with great rapidity. Immigration was pouring in fast, under the pressure of inexorable military service and the danger of war in Europe. To take advantage of this increase of population a number of large railway land-grants were pressed upon Congress, and passed, and others that had lain dormant for years were actively entered upon.¹ An unexampled railway mania sprang up. The market for American securities in England, Germany, and Holland became very active, so active, indeed, that the ordinary rules of prudence were entirely cast aside

(1) The whole number of acres, good and bad, available under old and new grants, was 170,208,000, three-fourths of which was offered to the various Pacific railways—the largest grant being to the Northern Pacific, 47,000,000 acres. Grants to the amount of 6,859,000 acres have been forfeited and not renewed.

by the investors. Rascals on both sides of the water hastened to put their sickles into this bounteous harvest. Schemes and prospectuses were sowed broadcast over Germany that no American would put a dollar in, and were greedily taken up.¹ Others, that Germany and England rejected, were eagerly taken by Americans, and in the end both sorts went to perdition together. Town and county bonds in aid of railways were voted by populations by wholesale. There was a great speculation in iron. Prices rose rapidly, and mills and furnaces were multiplied. The average increment of railway mileage in the country from 1859 to 1869 had been under 2,000 miles per year. In 1869 it rose to 4,953 miles; in 1870, to 5,690 miles; in 1871, to 7,670 miles. In 1872, the market for railway bonds both at home and abroad showed signs of glut, and the railway increment for the year fell back to 6,167 miles, in 1873 to 3,948 miles, and in 1874 to 1,940 miles. Meanwhile, general speculation spread on all sides. Imports and exports increased rapidly. The loans and discounts of the banks mounted up six times faster than the deposits. The loan market had been extremely capricious for a year or two before the panic, but there was an average rise in the rate of interest, culminating in the autumn of 1872, from which period it gradually fell till the spring of 1873, when it again commenced rising, and continued rising till September, when it went out of sight completely. The usury law, which still remains in force in the chief commercial city, and in nearly all the States, renders it difficult to obtain the exact rates of interest, since banks and other moneyed corporations are compelled to square their transactions, ostensibly at least, by the legal rate (7 per cent. in New York). The rates are of two kinds: 1, for short date commercial paper; 2, for call loans, on collateral security. In a normal condition of the money market the rates for call loans are 2 to 3 per cent. below the commercial rate, but in a period of

(1) Take, for example, the Rockford, Rock Island and St. Louis railway. Bonds to the amount of \$9,000,000, in this superfluous and ridiculous enterprise, were sold at something near par, principally in Germany. They afterwards declined to 6 cents per dollar. Some litigation which took place last year, over this property, disclosed the fact that the two firms of Budge, Schiff, and Co., of New York, and Moritz Budge, of Frankfort-on-the-Main, pocketed \$1,427,423 for their exertions in selling these insecurities to their countrymen. After other means of squeezing the property and the bondholders had been exhausted, resort was had to speculating in gold with the funds in the treasury. Mr. Boody, the treasurer, testified that Budge and Co. claimed that they had lost \$100,000 in one such operation, and \$44,000 in another, and that they demanded to be reimbursed from the funds of the company. "I asked them at the time," says Mr. Boody, "for a statement—the parties from whom they had bought gold, the amount purchased from each; they declined to give it. Subsequently in writing I demanded the information, and in writing they refused to give it, but the loss was incurred, and charged to the company.

Question. Is that included in this amount?

Answer. Yes; I never believed there was any gold bought or any gold sold."

great stringency, like the autumn of 1872, they rise much higher than the commercial rate. This apparent anomaly is probably accounted for by the fact that in the time of stringency loans on commercial paper are largely a matter of favouritism, whereas call loans for carrying stocks are governed by the strict rules of supply and demand. The *Financial Review* says, "For two years prior to the financial crisis of 1873 the money market had worked with extraordinary closeness, the rates paid on call loans occasionally reaching $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ of 1 per cent. per diem, in addition to the legal rate of 7 per cent. per annum. The remarkable stringency in money arose from the immense demand which sprang up from new railway enterprises, and also to supply the general speculative operations which had been fostered by the issues of paper money, and which went on until checked by the monetary pressure that reached a climax in the panic of 1873. During 1874 money was unusually easy." I shall be compelled to dissent from the opinion here expressed, that the speculative operations were fostered in any peculiar sense by the issues of paper money. The *Review* then gives the rates of interest on commercial paper for a series of years, from which the following are selected :—

Year.	January.	May.	July.	September.	November.
1872	8 to 10	7 to 8	6 to 7	10 to 12	12
1873	9 to 12	5 to 7	6 to 7	—	12 to 18
1874, average for whole year					6
1875	"	"			5½

The next exhibit of importance in the present investigation is the statistics of bank deposits and bank loans. The returns are for the month of October in each year except 1873, which are for September 12 :—

DEPOSITS AND LOANS AND DISCOUNTS OF THE NATIONAL BANKS OF THE UNITED STATES IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS.

	1868.	1869.	1870.	1871.	1872.	1873.
Deposits	579	511	507	600	613	622
Loans and discounts	657	682	712	827	872	940

DEPOSITS AND LOANS AND DISCOUNTS OF THE NATIONAL BANKS OF NEW YORK CITY.

	1869.	1870.	1871.	1872.	1873.
Individual deposits .	136	127	141	117	111
Loans and discounts .	158	168	198	175	199

The reader will observe the comparative steadiness of bank deposits in the country at large during the whole period, and the rapid expansion of loans and discounts, especially the increase of twenty-four millions in New York city from 1872 to 1873 on an actual decrease of deposits. The expansion of bank loans is a noted phenomenon of periods antecedent to commercial crises, so much so that one might almost venture to estimate the nearness of a crisis by comparing the tables of different periods. This increase of bank loans, as I shall show hereafter, is a consequence and not a cause of the state of commercial activity which ends in panic and crash.

It has already been remarked that the antecedents of the American crisis of 1873 were identical in their nature with every other commercial crisis of which any account can be found, viz., speculation, or the act of buying with a view to selling at a higher price, and over-trading, or the act of buying and selling too much on a given capital. Most commonly these two elements are accompanied by two others, namely, the destruction or loss of previously accumulated capital, and the rapid conversion of circulating into fixed capital. Speculation and destruction of capital usually go together in preparing the way for a crisis. Speculation may bring on a crisis without the destruction of capital. If people go in debt to each other for tulip bulbs at a thousand florins each, as the Dutch did in the seventeenth century, and tulips suddenly fall in the market, it will be found that the debts remain a fixed sum while the assets have shrunk to a much less value, and a crisis will be the result, a crisis of more or less intensity according to the number of persons and interests involved, directly and indirectly, in the traffic. The tulips will remain in the community, and their utility in people's gardens will be as great as ever. Consequently there may be no resulting loss of capital, though a great many people may be ruined. There may be a very extensive and unsatisfactory transfer of property among different members of the community without any loss in the aggregate. I say this may happen, but what almost always does happen is that there is an aggregate loss resulting from the bad investment of capital during the speculative period.

The element of credit is an essential ingredient of a financial crisis. However great the destruction of capital may be at any time, there can be no such thing as a revulsion if nobody is in debt. There may be a famine, but there can be no crisis if nobody owes more than he can pay. There may be hard times and great scarcity resulting from war, fires, floods, bad harvests, and other calamities, but without the relation of debtor and creditor there will be no financial crisis. It may happen that at a time when the business of a country is on a really sound basis some unforeseen event, or some unobserved train of circumstances, may sweep off so much capital in so short a space of time that existing debts cannot be paid with what is left. I cannot

recall any case where this has been the sole cause. The English crisis of 1847 was undoubtedly greatly aggravated and perhaps precipitated by the failure of the potato crop in Ireland, and the absorption of a large amount of capital in railway construction, but it was set on foot by heavy speculations during the two preceding years, and the bankruptcies actually began among the grain speculators. Even in such a case as this the debts are the essential element of the crisis.

I therefore offer this definition. A financial crisis consists of an undue accumulation of debts based upon exaggerated and fanciful ideas of the value of property, usually accompanied by the destruction and loss of capital, and the rapid conversion of circulating into fixed capital.

Acquaintance with the fundamental principles of currency and exchange is presumed in the readers of this Review. Only such reference will be made to them in the present discussion, as may be necessary to preserve continuity of argument. All trade is at bottom barter. Property and services are really exchanged for each other. Money, currency, bank notes, cheques, bills of exchange and clearing houses are different instruments, or tools, for facilitating the exchange of property with the greatest amount of exactitude and the least amount of friction. All exchanges are made, however, and all contracts must be settled, in terms of the pound sterling, the dollar, the franc, or whatever may be the money of the country. Bank deposits consist, for the most part, of written evidences of ownership, or title-deeds, of the circulating capital of the country—the wheat, cotton, cattle, iron, yarn, sugar, coal, linen, and other property in transit between producer and consumer, whether the producers and consumers be in the same country or in different countries. The proportion which currency (bank notes, government notes and gold) bears to drafts, cheques, and bills of exchange (representing property in transit), varies according to the density of population and the habits of the people. In Anglo-Saxon countries it may be said to vary according to density of population only. In London, the drafts, cheques, &c., are about 97 per cent. of the bank deposits; in New York about 90; in Chicago about 80. A bank deposit usually represents a sale of property, the proceeds of which the bank undertakes to collect, and if the depositor is in good standing, the amount is immediately placed to his credit. A bank cheque usually represents a purchase; and the various sales and purchases are offset against each other at the clearing houses, and the balances paid in the legal tender of the country.

Now all the debts in the country have to be paid out of its circulating capital, and if any process is going on whereby the aggregate of debt is unduly increased in proportion to the capital, or the capital unduly diminished in proportion to the debt, you may be sure there

is a crisis brewing. When I commenced to examine the crisis of 1873 I had the impression that there had been a considerable diminution of circulating capital, owing to the railway and public and private building mania, the great fires, and the manifest increase of expenditure among all classes, for some years prior to the panic; but when I came to look at the tables of the bank deposits I found that I was mistaken. These deposits are an accurate index of the amount of circulating capital in the country at different times, and the loans and discounts of the banks are an accurate index of the amount of debt contracted at different times. Of course there are other debts (a very large amount), not shown in the bank loans and other circulating property (especially in the districts not provided with banks), not shown in the deposits; but the movement of loans and deposits is a *perfectly good criterion to show what is going on in the community*. Well, we find that from 1868 to September 12, 1873, the national bank deposits had increased \$43,000,000, but the loans had increased in the same time \$283,000,000—that is, the aggregate debt had increased 50 per cent. in five years, while the aggregate circulating capital had increased only $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.* The capital during this period had been and continued to be practically a fixed quantity.¹ Only the surplus produced each year, added to what was

(1) This view is confirmed by the internal traffic of the country. The number of tons moved by railway showed an average increase from year to year, which continued, as did also the bank deposits, after the panic. Poor's "Railway Manual of the United States," a standard authority, shows that the quantity of goods transported (measured by tons) was somewhat greater in 1874 than in 1873, although the gross earnings were \$6,000,000 less. The following comparative statement is compiled from the same authority, showing the railway earnings, operating expenses, &c., for the calendar years 1873 and 1874.

Year.	Number of Miles.	Gross Earnings.	Operating Expenses.	Percentage of Expenses to Gross Earnings.	Net Earnings.	Dividends.
1873	70,651	\$ 526,419,935	\$ 342,609,373	65.1	\$ 183,810,562	\$ 67,120,709
1874	72,623	520,466,016	330,895,058	63.6	189,570,958	67,042,942

The external traffic showed a similar but more irregular increase. The following tables show the imports and exports of merchandise (gold values) for a series of years, including the year of panic.

Year ending June 30th.	Imports.	Exports.
	\$	\$
1868	358,733,098	370,555,738
1869	414,256,243	371,045,149
1870	452,875,665	455,208,341
1871	518,769,518	478,115,292
1872	573,912,888	476,421,478
1873	684,633,736	575,227,017
1874	695,865,248	633,339,368

"I doubt if there would be found a single example of a great increase of fixed capital, at a time and place where circulating capital was not rapidly increasing likewise." Mill's "Political Economy," Book I., chapter vi.

borrowed from abroad, had been invested in railways, buildings, and other fixed property; but the aggregate amount of debt was a steadily increasing quantity, growing more top-heavy each year, until, like an inverted pyramid, a very slight push or gust of wind would tip it over. That the reaction really commenced in 1872 is shown by the extraordinary rise in the rate of interest, and by the great increase in the number of failures, and the amount of liabilities represented, over the previous year. Nevertheless the centre of gravity was not thrown wholly outside the base till the following year. During this twelvemonth the bank loans increased \$68,000,000, against an increase of only \$7,000,000 in the deposits—that is, the debts increased $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in one year, while the available capital increased only $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. In New York city, where the avalanche of insolvency first began to move, the indebtedness increased during that year, by the same showing, 13 per cent., while the available capital *decreased* 5 per cent. The failure of Jay Cooke and Company did not produce the panic in any other way than this—that it disclosed to the public the pre-existing fact that the aggregate indebtedness was too great to be paid out of the circulating capital. If John Doe has borrowed some millions, payable on demand, having nothing better to sell than Northern Pacific bonds, and if Richard Roe comes into the market with some millions of bushels of wheat, and both are striving to get possession of the same—I had almost said money, but it is better to stick to the text and say circulating capital, that is, iron, shoes, cloth, sugar, pork, furniture, &c.—then if there is not enough for both, Richard Roe will surely get it and John Doe will fail. And so as to all the rest. Those whose debts are largest, in proportion to their means of commanding the circulating capital of the country, or, in the language of commerce, those whose liabilities are largest in proportion to their available assets, will fail first. Those debts, contracted on a scale of imaginary prosperity, were incapable of shrinking down to the real facts. When the facts were actually disclosed in September, 1873, every business man was quick to recognise their import, and all clutched simultaneously at the means of payment. This clutching constituted the panic.

Monetary panics are always of short duration. A few months after the panic of 1873, money was plentiful in all the business centres, and borrowers with good collaterals could get all they wanted at 4 per cent.; but the crisis—the Nemesis of the violated laws of commerce—was taking vengeance in all directions upon the guilty and the innocent, and especially upon the innocent—the labourers in furnaces and factories, the sewing women, and the small savings depositors. A panic is usually described as a want of confidence, with the implication that if people would only have confidence

business would settle down into its customary channel. And so it would, if the want of confidence were not well founded. But if the deck-load of liabilities is really too great for the ballast of capital, the craft will turn over, and no proclamation of confidence can stay it up; nor can any issue of bank notes or government notes prop it up. The deficiency is a deficiency not of promises to pay, but of *the means of payment*, and the means of payment are the commodities of commerce, including the commodity gold, which foreigners are always willing to take in exchange for their surplus, or for any debts we may be owing them.

What followed the panic, and what continues to this day, is the painful and impossible effort to pay a very large amount of indebtedness with a relatively small amount of capital. The portion which cannot be paid must be sponged out by the bankruptcy courts or by compromise. Meanwhile, as railway extension and large building operations have come to a pause, and as nearly all persons are deprived of some part of their usual and expected income, and are forced to economize in their expenditures, we have the phenomenon of a glut in the market, and this at a time when, as has been shown, there is really a deficiency of commodities to pay existing debts with. The apparent anomaly would disappear if the holders of the surplus commodities would give them to the bankrupt debtors to pay off their liabilities with; for consumption would then revive. The holders of Northern Pacific bonds—this case is used for illustration merely—being in receipt of their usual income, would be able once more to purchase. The production of the country had adjusted itself before the panic to a certain rate of consumption, and when consumption was checked production went on, not so rapidly as before, but still too rapidly for the diminished means of consumers. Over-production, stagnation, and loss of employment are thus explained. The duration of the hard times depends for the most part on the percentage that bankrupt estates are able to pay, and on the expeditiousness of the payment.¹ Something will depend upon

(1) "Estimating the average yield of failed estates to be 33½ per cent. (under the operations of the new bankruptcy law it will fall far short of that), the actual loss to capital account, by the failures of the year (1875), will stand at about \$120,000,000. This amount is equivalent to the value of one half of the cotton crop, and is more by 30 per cent. than the entire yield of all the gold and silver mines of the country. It is a serious loss that individuals have to bear, to be deducted from the profits of business, or to trench on the accumulations of previous years. This 120 millions of loss represents a profit at 10 per cent. on 1,200 millions of dollars of business; in other words, that amount of business of the country for the past year has been done for nothing, the profits being absorbed by losses. This loss of 120 millions of dollars is luckily diffused over a good many centres of trade, and has been pretty equally divided between individual concerns; but it is safe to infer that, coupled with the decline in values, the loss by bad debts must have caused a shrinkage more apparent than in any year since the panic."—R. G. Dun and Co.'s Annual Circular, for the year 1875.

"The figures which we present herewith do not give much encouragement to the

the number of failures yet to come. To ascertain what is requisite to restore general prosperity is a complicated problem, since some trades are depressed more than others, wheat-growing being fairly prosperous, while iron-smelting is nearly prostrate. Between these extremes many degrees of depression are to be found. Given a certain number of people trained to certain vocations, and a certain amount of fixed capital, what is needed to put the unemployed portion to work? Manifestly either new markets, or such a lessening of the cost of production as will bring their respective commodities within reach of a larger body of consumers. Both wages and profits have already fallen in particular trades, and it seems probable that they will fall still more—how much more can only be determined by the course of events. Free-trade would lessen the cost of production by giving manufacturers cheaper materials, and would thereby open new markets to certain articles. It is therefore suggested as one step, and an important one, out of the present slough.

*The currency has been purposely left out of view in discussing the financial crisis, partly because it tends to befog the real facts constituting the crisis, and partly because I conceive that it had very little to do with bringing it on. It could have had nothing to do with it except in one of two ways, either by diminishing the amount of circulating capital, or by increasing the amount of indebtedness based thereon. Some persons contend that the use of an irredeemable currency does stimulate the creation of debts. That it should do so while the currency is expanding—that is, while it is depreciating—can be very easily understood, since it offers to speculators the opportunity of pocketing the difference between its value to-day and its value at a future time, but that it should tend to this result in any great degree while the volume is stationary, I cannot perceive. Hence I reject the notion that the currency, irredeemable though it be, was any considerable agent in bringing on the crisis. A similar crisis exists at the present time in countries where the currency has all the time been redeemable in gold, and other crises, and worse ones, have existed in America at periods when the currency was redeemable in gold. Indeed, similar crises have occurred in places where there was no paper currency whatever. Irredeemable currency has sins enough of its own to answer for without loading it with transgressions in no way peculiar to it, and having an entirely different parentage.

belief that the return of a prosperous condition is any nearer, except in the passage of time, than a year ago. The business of the country, in every department, continues to be restricted to the narrowest limits. Without a corresponding reduction in expenses, and in the face of declining prices of all staples, the possibilities of profit have been slight indeed. It is, therefore, not a matter of surprise that so many have succumbed to the pressure of the times; the wonder rather is, that with all the discouragement which in the past two or three years has been experienced, so many survive in a condition of apparent stability."—*Ibid.*, first quarter of 1876,

The practical exemption of France from the financial crises which periodically afflict America, England, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries, deserves our attention. Even the great financial typhoon of 1857, which swept around the world and across the equator, only skirted the edges of France, causing a few failures in Havre and Marseilles, chiefly in the American trade, and advancing the rate of discount of the Bank of France for a short time to 10 per cent.¹ For all practical purposes France was in the centre of a cyclone, enjoying a calm, while the rest of the civilised world was strewn with every species of commercial desolation. And such has been her position in the crisis of 1873, notwithstanding the payment of the milliards to Germany. Germany, however, the recipient of the milliards, has been convulsed with hard times and mercantile distress. The reason is simply that the Frenchman is very little addicted to going in debt, very little inclined to speculate, and very much given to hoarding his gains. Perhaps he does not get rich quite so fast as his neighbour across the Channel, but on the other hand he keeps what he gets, and generally escapes those terrible financial crashes that smite the Teutonic and Anglo-Saxon countries with such clockwork regularity. The Frenchman seems to have taken to heart the lesson taught by the great Mississippi bubble, to keep out of mad speculations. Neither the Englishman nor his offspring, the American, learned anything of lasting value from the South Sea bubble or the score of bubbles that have since burst at different times on their hands. Nor has the plodding and methodical German, so apt a scholar in many directions, learned this lesson, although commended to him by frequent and severe chastisement. There is no mystery whatever in the healthy condition of the French finances and French trade since the payment of the German war indemnity. France habitually holds not less than £240,000,000 sterling of the precious metals.² Such a reserve of the most realisable property known to commerce, coupled with the national prudence on the subject of debt, and the national habit of putting little or no money into things they know nothing about, very readily accounts for the practical exemption of France from these sore visitations. It is an encouraging sign of the times that the French people are beginning to appreciate their high position in the world of industry and commerce, and to place thrift, in which they indubitably excel, in the balance against military prowess, in which they can no longer claim pre-eminence.

(1) Art. "Les Crises Commerciales et Monétaires," by E. de Laveleye, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Jan. 1, 1866. From another article in the *Revue* (Nov. 15, 1865), by V. Bonnet, it appears that an advance of the rate of discount to 7 per cent. by the Bank of France is considered there a financial crisis.

(2) V. Bonnet, in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, July 1, 1873.

Much stress is laid by some writers on the agency of banks in bringing on financial crises by an undue expansion of loans or note circulation, or both. Perhaps we have a right to expect that bankers will be wiser than others in discerning the approach of these catastrophes, and more prudent in applying the brakes to prevent them. But, in fact, they are not wiser than others, they never have been—unless those of Scotland may be called an exception—and they probably never will be. They live in the same atmosphere as other people, and when it becomes surcharged with the oxygen of high prices, large profits, active speculation, and a delusive prosperity, they become exhilarated with the rest, and make large loans. They are importuned to do so by their customers, and impelled to do so by their interest. It is the high prices, the large profits, the speculation, and the appearance of prosperity, that bring on bank expansion. It is not bank expansion that causes the high prices, the speculation, &c. It is not in the power of banks to expand either their loans or their note circulation, except in response to a pre-existing outside demand. Bank notes redeemable in coin do not raise prices. The competition of buyers in the market does this.¹ After every great crisis the banks are fiercely denounced for their excessive expansion. Or rather, they are first denounced for not expanding more, and then for having expanded so much previously. Both accusations are mainly unjust. As to expanding more in the midst of a panic, that is a sheer impossibility. Each frog is as big as an ox already—unless he has been an exceptionally prudent, unambitious member of the community—and his very existence depends on getting down to his natural size. The other reproach is likewise unjust, unless we assume that bankers ought to be wiser than everybody else in the trading community, and sufficiently wiser and stronger to hold everybody else in check. In countries where banking is free—and private banking is free in all civilised countries—it is perfectly futile to expect any such thing, since depositors will generally place their funds where they can get the amount of accommodation they think they are entitled to. Even the Scotch bankers, whose prudence and prescience on the whole have excited general admiration, can show in their own midst some of the worst cases of financial incendiarism on record.

What it is that sets a general speculation going can hardly be considered an open question. The tendency of profits to a minimum, the competition of capital, the smallness of the field of employment in particular countries, the restiveness of the owners of capital when they find their profits growing less and less, the temptation to

(1) This is a principle sought to be established (and successfully established) in Tooke's "History of Prices." The distinction between bank notes and other credit instruments on the one hand, and the "act of buying," on the other, as applied to this subject, is very clearly presented in Mr. Bonamy Price's "Principles of Currency," p. 168.

embark in new schemes when old and well-tried investments have absorbed all the capital that can be profitably employed in them : all this is so lucidly set forth in Book IV. chapter iv. of Mill's *Political Economy*, that nothing remains to be said on that point, except that the antecedents of the last American crisis were a striking verification of the theory. The accumulation of capital had been manifested in the steady advance of public securities, the infallible sign of the competition of investors, and the usual precursor of that sort of enterprise which ends in a financial crash. The experience of 1857 had been forgotten ; the war was ended and the road was clear for a fresh run. England, by virtue of her smaller territory and her larger annual surplus, had another break-down in 1866, yielding one failure (that of Overend, Gurney, & Co.,) with liabilities of nearly nineteen millions sterling, or more than one-third of all the mercantile failures that happened in the United States in 1873. The field of employment for capital in America is still a large one, but it is not so large as formerly. Every year witnesses a nearer approach of population to the arid plains of the West. The railway development of the country is a long way in advance of population at present, and that outlet for surplus earnings is closed for a considerable time. What direction the competition of capital will take next is not certain, but it is more likely to be in the way of free-trade and foreign commerce than any other. Resumption of specie payments can be effected at any time when there is a real purpose and desire on the part of the political majority to accomplish it. It can be done either by funding the surplus greenbacks in an interest-bearing bond, or by applying a portion of the public revenues to the redemption and cancellation of such surplus, or (which is the most awkward and expensive mode), by accumulating a mass of gold in the treasury to redeem them over the counter. Any mode which may be adopted implies a contraction of the currency to the volume needed for that portion of the country's business in which currency is actually used, viz. :—hand-money or pocket-money as distinguished from bank funds. So much ignorance, demagogism, and unenlightened selfishness, are enlisted in this battle of Gog and Magog, that some stern use of executive or judicial power may be necessary to put an end to it ; for there is mischief enough hidden in it to divide the Union and revolutionise the component parts. That the greenback is a past-due note, a defaulted I.O.U., and every reissue of it, after it has been taken in for taxes, an illegal act as well as a shameful one, is perfectly clear to lawyers as well as economists.¹

(1) The United States Supreme Court, in the case of *Hepburn v. Griswold*, held that the power to make Government notes a legal tender existed, if at all, only as a necessary and proper means to carry on war. This view was virtually sustained in the subsequent opinion of the Court in the *Legal Tender* cases, although the judgment in *Hepburn v. Griswold* was reversed.

In conclusion I ask, is it not humiliating that the Anglo-Saxon race, who have achieved so much in the way of conquering natural obstacles, subduing the earth, civilising barbarous tribes, establishing free institutions, and promoting education, cannot subsist without sowing the wind and reaping the whirlwind of a financial crisis, two or three times in each generation? Is it not possible for the English-speaking people (and the German-speaking people as well) to perform their important office in the world without bringing upon themselves periodically these direful visitations? Must our trade degenerate into gambling every few years, and by its evil consequences plunge great multitudes of innocent people into the depths of misery? The mere destruction or expulsion of surplus capital from a country of high productive powers is not a very great evil, since the vacuum is so speedily and easily filled. But considering the noble uses to which it might be applied, it would be best not to lose it. The distribution of wealth has become a more important consideration in Europe and America than its production, and here I venture to think that the French are in advance of other nations, not in virtue of any written theory, or governmental policy, but through those close-fisted habits which have been handed down from father to son and mother to daughter—the habit not merely of living within one's means, but of keeping one's means well in sight—contentment with small gains, and horror of debt. Where these national habits exist, and to the extent that they exist, the fuel of financial crises is wanting, and the poor are not liable to be thrown on their savings for support every few years during the interval of readjustment between a crisis and a revival of trade. It is not proposed to discuss here the merits and demerits of hoarding the precious metals, which is, after all, only a question of having more or less ready means in proportion to the extent of one's business. We all know that the Frenchman *will* hoard to a large extent, and that the Englishman and American *will not*. Let us accept the fact as it is, and with it the fact that when financial gales blow the Frenchman carries more ballast than any rival craft afloat. Probably the Anglo-Saxon peoples—I might have mentioned Canada in discussing the crisis of 1873, for she has suffered quite as much *per capita* as the States—will continue to go headlong at intervals in the future as in the past. Within a short time we have heard of a movement, seriously considered by the English Government, to appoint a standing commission to suspend the Bank Act in times of great stringency. This might be likened to a farmer permanently lowering the fence that confines his cattle, because it had been deemed expedient at some former times to take down the top rail. If suspension of the Bank Act is ever useful, its utility consists in quieting the fears of those who have no debts to pay—in stopping a

run for deposits—in checking a blind panic. Those who have debts to pay will still be compelled to draw out their funds. But the knowledge that there is a standing commission to suspend the Act will encourage traders to take greater risks, and thus tend to bring about the contingency for which the commission is appointed. And in the end the Bank itself must be the judge, and the sole judge, of its ability to exchange its notes payable on demand for the notes of merchants payable some time hence. The Bank has no power to create *the means of payment*, and there is fortunately no power to compel it to expose itself to insolvency any more than a private individual. So many lessons have been administered to the Anglo-Saxon communities on the subject of financial crises, without effect, that it might seem to have become a matter of general agreement and convention among them that a crisis once in a while is a good thing. Very few Americans are of that opinion to-day.

HORACE WHITE.

A BALLAD OF PAST MERIDIAN.

I.

ONE night returning from my twilight walk
I met the grey mist Death, whose eyeless brow
Was bent on me, and from his hand of chalk
He reached me flowers as from a withered bough :
O Death, what bitter nosegays givest thou !

II.

Death said, "I gather," and pursued his way.
Another stood by me, a shape in stone,
Sword-hacked and iron-stained, with breasts of clay,
And metal veins that sometimes fiery shone :
O Life, how naked and how hard when known !

III.

Life said, "As thou hast carved me," such am I.
Then memory, like the nightjar on the pine,
And sightless hope, a woodlark in night sky,
Joined notes of Death and Life till night's decline :
Of Death, of Life, those inwound notes are mine.

GEORGE MEREDITH.

EARLY AUTUMN ON THE LOWER YANG-TZE.

IN Western lands the most welcome and most joyous of the seasons is the spring. In all ages poets have hymned its arrival, or invoked its approach. From sunny Italy to the chill and brumal North, they have sung the grateful change wrought upon the face of nature by the Favonian breeze, and the ethereal mildness of gentle spring. Its smiling sunlight and fertilising showers, its promise of a warmer and more productive time, have excited the imaginations of many more than poets, and have enriched the speech of nations with pleasing metaphors. The foreign sojourner in distant China, with half the globe between him and his Western home, hails with delight the advent of a more sober season. Having passed over vast and stormy seas, he has changed not only climate, but his mind—at least in this. The stifling heat and heavy rains of July and August have passed away. The fiery fierceness of the summer sun is no longer to be dreaded, nor the sweltering temperature of a cloudy afternoon. Cool mornings and delicious evenings, with noons not too sultry, make up the early autumn day. A delicate azure, broken by the white of fleecy clouds, replaces the brazen ardour of the summer sky, or the heavy fall of cloud and mist of the rainy months. The soft moisture of the oppressive south-west wind is dispelled, and the reviving breezes of the north-east monsoon blow gaily.

In the foreign settlements life enters upon a new phase. It is as though limbs were stretched and exercised after an interval of enforced repose. The Western stranger bethinks him of the sports and pastimes of his countrymen in their own land. The stable regains its interest; the race-committee is elected; the walls of the club-house display notices of the "autumn meeting," and lists of the events of the approaching race-week. On roads, and on open ground near the settlement, Chinese grooms—quaint objects, clad, but for the incongruous exception of the strange head-gear of their nation, in strict equestrian costume—are encountered leading out to exercise the "entries" for these events; diminutive steeds as carefully enveloped in the regulation clothing, as though just arrived from Eltham or the Wolds. But there are no such costly imports into China now. The golden age of foreign commerce, when the trade lay in the hands of a few princely firms, has gone, and with it many extravagances. The senior and junior messes at the *Hongs*, with their bounteous table and ever-flowing wines, have disappeared, and no "cracks" come from Europe to dispute the prizes of the Chinese turf with the native princes.

As autumn comes on, sportsmen look to their guns. The flight of birds moving southward is noted at seaports farther north, and the house-boat—most commodious of river conveyances—is prepared. On all sides there are symptoms of a cooler air. The punkah is unhooked from the ceiling, the punkah-coolie is paid off, and fire-places and stoves are set in order. Even the mosquito-curtain disappears from the bedroom;—this last being perhaps the most welcome of all the signs of autumn. Summer migrants from Shang-hai to cooler and more salubrious spots—to the heights and baths of Hakone, and the sea-bathing of Chefoo—return home. Passengers begin to arrive from Europe; and homeward-bound steamers carry but few away. Foreign admirals come in in their flag-ships, mustering their squadrons in the Woo-Sung River, and announce their arrival by thundering salutes. The anchorage is filled with steamers and stately clipper ships. The streets of the foreign settlement are crowded with a busy population, foreign and Chinese—officers, merchants, sailors on shore from the ships, braves from the camp outside the south gate of the native city, Chinese coolies and servants, jostle each other in a living stream as wide as that which flows through Cheapside at noon. On the Bund—the wide esplanade that embanks the river—pass and repass, in endless ebb and flow, handsome equipages, in which ride fashionably dressed European ladies—*jîn-rik-shas*, or man-power carriages, and the high-wheeled barrows—the hackney-coach of Eastern China. The Bund itself is a scene worth notice: a few years ago it was a foul, unwholesome marsh, scored with the runlets made by the receding tide. Now it rivals the quays of Paris. Well-kept and prettily laid-out gardens adorn its widest part. It is edged with bungalows embowered in shrubs and flowers, spacious consular residences, and imposing buildings, the premises of banks and great public companies, thronged with Western clerks and native *shroffs* and *compradores*. The styles of architecture are various—some stately, some fantastic. The prevailing style inclines to the classical, and is, according to the local jest, not Doric, but *Compradoric*. But the whole is not without a certain grandeur and an air of wealth.

Twelve miles lower down the Wong-pu—the branch of the Yang-tze which flows past Shang-hai—the stream is crossed by a bar of mud and silt, which precludes the approach to the city of heavy vessels. Therefore the huge ironclads and great frigates of the Western admirals lie moored below it, off the village of Woo-Sung. Their presence imparts liveliness to a usually dreary spot. Abreast of where they lie stand but three houses of European build, of which one is deserted; another is the office of the Great Northern Telegraph Company, the pioneer of telegraph enterprise in China. The banks on either side are low and uniformly flat. The entrance

to the river from the wide embouchure of the great Yang-tze recalls the lower Scheldt. Indeed, not in the configuration of the ground alone can a resemblance be traced to the Low Countries of Western Europe. A fleet of high-sterned craft, such as Vandervelde might have painted, is working up the river with a favourable tide. Clumps of green poplars break the sky-line, and diversify the dead level of the scene. Beneath their shade here and there come down to slake their thirst in the river, groups of cattle, recalling the canvas of Cuyp. Berghem or Hobbema might have painted such landscapes as those on which the eye can rest on either side.

The prospect of a stay of some weeks at Woo-Sung gave promise to the writer of but a dreary time. Cut off by the twelve miles of stream—the regular highway—from the pleasures and conveniences of Shang-hai, Occidentals, doomed to loiter below the bar, might well be forgiven their grumblings at the dulness of the place. The shooting season had not yet begun, or at any rate had hardly begun in these thickly populated plains. That unfailing resource of the sailor on shore—riding on horseback—was denied in this roadless district. A whirling current and muddy fore-shores precluded all hope of that most cheerful of naval recreations—hauling the seine. Kicking a foot-ball about the narrow strip of meadow that intervened between the embankment and the stream, or attempting sphairistiké on a polygonal scrap of rugged lawn, would inevitably grow tiresome when the ball in one case was being perpetually kicked into the river, or in the other being knocked into a fetid drain. Resignation came at length, and was in some sort a solace; and a conscientious attempt was made to take advantage of whatsoever was interesting and novel in the surrounding scene.

To some at least the attempt turned out to be by no means unsuccessful. There was an air of strangeness about all that was seen and heard—about place, people, and occupations—which long retained its freshness and the pleasure-giving faculty of a new sensation. There was something almost startling in the obtrusive contact daily, nay hourly, observed between ancient habits and the most recent phases of modern civilisation. A mile farther down the stream, the brilliant flame of a Western lighthouse of the newest pattern gleamed throughout the night. A long line of telegraph posts stood gauntly up from the level fields. An endless succession of steamers—provided with the latest improvements in construction and equipment—passed and repassed, bound up or down the Yang-tze, or to or from the coast-ports north and south of the great river. Whilst within a stone's throw of the water's edge slumbered, as it were, in perfect unconsciousness of all these symptoms of progress, the China of Confucius. On the water the vivacity of the scene was heightened by depth of contrast. Huge river-steamers, such as ascend the St.

Lawrence or crowd the levées at New Orleans, were constantly going to, or returning from, Hankow, six hundred miles above the mouth of the great stream, their decks crowded with natives of the middle kingdom, and their names inscribed in Chinese characters on their paddle-boxes. A whole fleet of trading-vessels of recent European type plied between Shang-hai and the other ports, bearing the dragon flag, which it has become a convention of the sea to recognise as the ensign of China. Trim ships of the Peninsular and Oriental Company and the statelier vessels of the *Messageries Maritimes* threaded their way amidst fleets of junks of a form so ancient as to have been familiar in these waters before the alluvial flats on either hand were laid down. The stillness of the early autumn morning air was perpetually broken by a noisy concert of sailors' voices. The deep song of the Western leadsmen calling the soundings, and the sharp orders of the European pilots, mingled with the chant of the Chinese mariners, hoisting the sails of mat, or celebrating their return from the open sea by the loud crackle of fireworks exploded in sacrifice to the River-god. Smart pilot-schooners, trim and saucy as Solent yachts, skimmed lightly over the smooth surface of the stream. Whilst the lumbering junks of Amoy and Ningpo, with their multiplicity of masts and towering poops, dropped slowly down to run home again before the monsoon, which, with Oriental patience, had been awaited for nigh six months.

Once landed on the river-shore, the stranger left behind him almost all trace of Western intrusion, save indeed when an occasional backward glance revealed above the trees the tall masts of foreign vessels, or a black cloud of coal-smoke from the funnel of a steamer. The landscape was as strange and foreign as were the inhabitants and their customs. For many miles to the right and to the left, to the front and on the other side of the river, stretched the wide level of a vast alluvial plain, which in less than a thousand years¹ has grown up between the city of Shang-hai and the sea. Roads there were none, but between the fields there were numerous smooth but narrow paths on which pedestrians could walk easily and comfortably in Indian file. The top of the embankment of the river offered a convenient, but rather roundabout way to Shang-hai. The path which ran along its summit for some seven or eight English miles met, six miles below the city, the broad and well-kept esplanade, known as *The Point* road, one of several handsome drives, constructed by the municipal council of the foreign settlement. A little farther inland was a broad strip of uncultivated land reserved, and in some shape actually put in order, for what will be the first

* "The custom-house officer was in A.D. 1101 ordered to remove to Shang-hai, which then became the seaport, and rapidly increased in importance."—"Shang-hai considered Socially." By H. Lang. 2nd edit., p. 5. Shanghai, 1875.

railway in China. But that this is crossed in several places by broad canals, it would soon become the high-road between Woo-Sung and the city. As it was, our road—the usual one—wound in its greater length between fields and farmhouses, through villages, and past temples in the most perplexing meanderings. Canals and streams had to be crossed on bridges of long slabs of stone, sometimes double, but often only single, and so narrow as to make crossing a somewhat precarious undertaking.

The whole surface of the plain was covered with the autumn cotton-crop still standing. The economic husbandry of China lays hold of every bit of ground, and not a single rood was lying fallow. In the spring this vast extent of cotton-covered ground, now a snowy expanse of fleecy bolls, starred here and there with bright sulphur-yellow blossom, had been one huge field of waving corn. During the rainy months, such is the fertility of the rich alluvial soil, it had produced its third crop—namely, rice. There was an air of quiet, of peace and plenty, pervading the whole district. Its denizens seemed neither to heed nor to require the products of other lands. Villages there were none to be seen. The inhabitants dwelt in single homesteads, or in snug cottages, collected in little groups, like tiny hamlets, of three or four. These pleasantly diversified the landscape. Clumps of trees, from between which peered out the quaint, curved roof, so marked a feature of the architecture of Eastern China, cut the sky-line, and redeemed the view from the dull monotony of an endless plain. The farms bore the aspect of being owned by the well-to-do. As the narrow pathway passed in front of each prosperous-looking homestead, it widened into a smooth esplanade. On the one hand a broad trench divided the roadway from the fields; on the other ran a neat lattice-fence, deftly woven of split bamboo—often overgrown with a luxuriant creeper which surrounded the little garden and the various farm-buildings. Within this fence stood the stately trees which overshadowed the roofs, and rows of a slim and graceful bamboo growing not in clusters as farther south, but in single stems. The little plot between the house-walls and the paling was planted with lettuces and other vegetables. The Chinese husbandman grudges even a corner to garden-flowers; but here and there bloomed a few asters or chrysanthemums which would put our Temple-garden shows to shame; and, once in a way, the gorgeous crimson of the gigantic Chinese cockscomb glowed against the dingy background of the farmhouse wall. The first tints of autumn were already deepening on the leaves, and rich yellows, browns, and reds added colour to a picture which would otherwise have presented too great a sameness of hue.

The dwellings invariably faced the esplanade, and filled up an interval in the fence which joined them at either end. We will

describe one. It was long and low, without an upper story. The principal room was in the centre, and was entered by wide folding doors. Within it the members of the family who were not in the fields could be seen at meals, or at indoor work. Some few, perhaps, were weaving long strips of coarse cotton-cloth on the esplanade in front. At a window was an aged dame whirling a spinning-wheel, or turning the rollers of the simple machine that frees the white tufts of cotton from the seeds. A sharp, twanging sound issued from a chamber at the side. By inquiry we learnt that it was caused by young lads "teazing" the cotton into thin flakes with a quaint implement like a fiddle-bow. The stranger was received with civility, or rather with that absence of incivility which seems the sum-total of politeness among the Chinese.

A hideous chorus, set up by the yelping curs which infested every homestead in the neighbourhood; a sharp reproof from the farmer or his lads, which produced silence or low and scarcely audible growls; a ready response, in pantomime, to a question in the same form as to the way; and then a relapse into silence and busy labour, as though no one of foreign race was within a league—such was the stranger's only greeting.

The children and the younger women retreated within the gates, or back to the farther corners of the room, when the strange face of the "barbarian" was seen approaching. The former had already donned their winter clothing, as early and late the autumn air was fresh and nipping. The blue blouses and leggings, quilted and stuffed with cotton, were piled on one above another, till the little wearers looked like miniature balloons. The gait of the women, with their poor pinched feet, according to the universal custom in these northern provinces, was ungraceful in the extreme, and they toddled about in so uncertain a manner as to excite astonishment at their untiring industry in the fields. Their dress was tasteless in shape and colour; and their features lacked even the slight share of good looks possessed by their sisters of the provinces further south.

There was little to attract the stranger to stay, or to induce him to investigate the style and processes of the native farm. Foul odours assailed his sense of smell as soon as he approached one of these latter. The ditch between the homestead and the fields was but a fetid sewer. Unutterable horrors were collected beneath the windows by the wayside, and the filth of the garments of men, women, and children was such as must be seen to be believed. The comfort and even abundance, of which so many signs were evident, was overlaid by a superlativeness of dirt which the squalor attendant on the most abject poverty can hardly match. The visitor gladly turned away to continue his walk, and to contemplate scenes which could only be enjoyed when looked at from afar.

Some way off from the farm rose a pile of buildings, evidently

those of a temple, as shown by two dark red poles in front. The walls, once vermilion, had faded through age and neglect to a dull orange. The ridge of the curved roof was ornamented with the scaly dragons so common in the ecclesiastical architecture of the country. Seen from a distance, there was a certain picturesqueness in the group. The orange tint harmonized not inaptly with the autumn hues of the surrounding groves. The bright green and yellow enamel of the earthenware monsters on the roof-tree, seen through Charles Lamb's "lucid atmosphere of fine Cathay," brightened a prospect not too wealthy in gay colours. On close inspection the charm of a distant view faded away. The buildings were little better than squalid barns. A wide opening in the front exposed an interior with three altars, and three hideous deities bedizened with a tawdry finery, rendered almost ghastly by filth and dust. A gateway at the side admitted to an ill-paved courtyard. On one side were the dwellings of the priests and keepers of the temple, store-houses, and hay-lofts; on the other an odd museum of spare divinities, clad, as the cold weather had approached, in faded garments of quilted cotton.

Here and there the plain was dotted with mounds of many sizes and varied shapes, the sepulchres of many generations of farmers of these lower Yang-tze shores. Some of these mounds were freshly made, and preserved their strictly conical form and sharp apex. Others were fading into the dead level around them, and were being more and more encroached upon by the ploughs and spades of the practically minded descendants of the departed agriculturists sleeping beneath. These barrows were not the only objects which marked the burial-places of the dead. Occasionally, tombs of brick with black-tiled roofs and whitewashed walls—miniature copies of the houses of the living—were met with. In many cases unburied coffins, sometimes perhaps lightly covered with a thin thatch of straw, were lying in the fields waiting till the priests should declare the geomantic conditions suitable for committing their mouldering contents to the ground.

Turning from these, we came upon a very different scene in the drama of life. Harsh but not discordant music was heard coming from a little troop conveying a bride to her new home. In front marched two musicians, one with a trumpet, the other with a kind of fife, from which instruments they occasionally drew out the fragments of a tune. The bride was hidden within the recesses of a scarlet-covered chair. The bearers and musicians were decked with unusual finery in honour of the occasion. Smart official hats with saucer brims and crimson tassels were on their heads, and loose garments of blue silk, covered, but scarcely hid, their own private rags. Behind the chair, on litters and frames of wood, painted a bright vermilion, were

borne the bridal presents, and the viands to be consumed at the wedding-feast—sweetmeats, vegetables, and small roasted pigs. A few friends or relatives brought up the rear of the small *cortège* as it wound and was lost to sight among the tombs.

In its many turnings the path again led the visitor to the near neighbourhood of the river. More music of the same kind, but somewhat more solemn and sonorous, was audible upon the right. From behind a clump of trees and bamboos, in which a snug homestead lay embowered, emerged a long procession. In front came the musicians, then several men carrying staves, then a gaily dressed object on a triumphal chair, and then a body of men and a very few women; all of whom together—perforce moving along the narrow path in single file—made up a goodly show. Upon the triumphal chair was seated, in gorgeous robes of scarlet, with a tinsel crown and jewels, a divinity of wood with a pink complexion, a long black beard, and Aryan features. The chair was borne high on the necks of four stalwart coolies; and by its side, steadying it as it swayed to and fro in its passage along the narrow way, walked with difficulty, owing to the narrowness of the path, a grave citizen of the higher class. Lictors, bearing stout staves, formed a body-guard. All—bearers, lictors, musicians—wore a peculiar head-dress, a kind of tall flower-pot-shaped hat, with a brim not unlike those seen in illustrations of the life of our English puritans.

As the procession passed in front of the homesteads, the inmates came out and exploded whole strings of crackers. In front of many houses small altars were placed, on which were burning slender scarlet tapers, and little sheaves of incense sticks placed in censers of brass or earthenware. Children were brought out by their mothers, and taught to render obeisance—to *chin-chin*, as the expression in the "Pidgin" dialect is—to the image as it was carried by. The blasts of music grew louder and louder, gongs were sounded, more crackers were exploded, and the procession turned off to wind about amongst the fields. Strange and grotesque as it all was, it still reminded the spectator of the periodical outings of St. Spiridione to bless the vineyards of the olive-groves of Corfu. Its meaning was thus explained in "Pidgin" by a bystander who had a slight knowledge of that wonderful dialect. Thrice a year the divinity is carried forth in solemn procession, that sickness may be warded off from the country.

A collection of *tumuli* lying in one spot, rather closer together than was usual, formed quite a hillock on the unending plain. Thither the procession wended its way, and on the summit of the eminence, in front of a table beneath an awning, the image was deposited. An attendant fired off four barrels of a quaint petard, volleys of crackers were exploded, and a fire was lighted on the

ground before the image. A Bonze, with completely shaven head, then advanced, recited a long prayer, and scattered bowlfuls of cooked rice on all sides. Piles of Chinese offertory money, made of gold and silver paper, were offered up and burned in the fire. The Bonze rang a bell and said more prayers; the image was lifted up in its chair, and the procession moved onward on its way.

A small temple stood not far off. In its main hall the divinities were being regaled with a sumptuous banquet. Three long tables covered with viands—sweetmeats, fruits, vegetables, and the inevitable roasted pig—were stretched athwart the pavement of the hall. At the upper end of each were placed three images, both male and female, all bedizened with a tawdry finery of tinsel and inferior silk. Here was a veritable *lectisternium*; on a small provincial scale it is true, but perhaps not an inexact reproduction of the great *Epulum Jovis* held ages ago in the Roman Capitol. Crowds of peasants were standing outside looking on. In the court in front were piled strange-looking instruments of music—fifes, trumpets of prodigious length, and guitars made of snake-skin.

In these sights there was nothing to recall even the existence of the Western nations, whose great outpost of commerce was so near at Shang-hai, and whose ships were covering the great river close at hand. But as the path along the river-bank was followed, many evidences of Western influence, and a quaint grafting of Western customs upon those of the Middle Kingdom were apparent. Woo-Sung was the scene of a smart action in the first war with a European power in which China was ever engaged, and long lines of parapet, forming a straggling and inefficient defence, pierced with many embrasures, could be traced upon the banks. But behind them a new work was rising, built upon different principles. Huge casemates were being constructed of balks of timber and iron plates from Europe, intended to hold guns as heavy as any that Woolwich can produce.¹ These works will be truly formidable to any enemy attempting to attack them in front. But the Chinese engineers, in carrying out the plans of foreigners, have had still some loyalty to ancient custom. So the forts were open in the rear, and were so placed that ships can lie behind an angle of the shore out of fire, and destroy the defenders.

Hundreds of men were at work hurrying on the construction. A large force of soldiers was lying in several entrenched camps close to. These men were disciplined and drilled in the English manner, and manœuvred in obedience to words of command given in English. They were armed with rifles, both breech and muzzle-loading, which they often practised with at targets on the shore. But at least one contingent of troops was still armed with spears and battle-axes;

(1) The successful construction of the 81-ton gun was not then known in China.

and it was a sight almost too suggestive to be comic, to witness a body of these exercising according to ancient fashion, and to an excessive tom-toming of a native drum, on the same parade-ground with comrades who complied with such directions as "Attention!" and "Quick march!" Large mud fortifications protected the camps. A common shape was that of a square, bastioned at the corners. The bastions bore some resemblance to those of Vauban, and were large enough to allow of an efficient flank defence; but the engineers had adhered to ancient plans, and had made their bastions mere solid masses of earth, and therefore shams. Imposing-looking *caponnières* and *tenailles* protected the curtains, but they were too slight to stop the passage even of a grape-shot.

Off the village a squadron of men-of-war junks lay at anchor. They were gaily dressed with flags—tricolours, white ensigns with vermilion characters upon them, and crimson streamers marked with legends in black. Higher up among the Western craft were handsome steam gunboats and a frigate, all armed with Krupp and Armstrong guns, with engines and hulls constructed by native artificers at Shang-hai or Foo-chow. The force of contrast could hardly go farther than in that presented by these two squadrons. Both were bravely decked with colours, those of the new type as well as their consort-junks. A new viceroi, who was to fix his seat at Nanking, was expected, and the vessels had mustered to do him honour.

He arrived in due time. In the early morning his vessel approached. The river-banks were alive with troops and spectators. Long lines of crimson banners gleamed through the slight mist just dispersing before the rising sun. The junks saluted with crackers and their guns of ancient form. More regular salutes were fired from the batteries by the troops on shore. The sailors of the frigate ran aloft, and manned the yards in imitation of the ceremonies obtaining in Western navies. There was a pleasant freshness in the gelid autumn air; and the waving banners and gay flags added brightness to an interesting scene. The viceroi was Shen-pao-Shan, a friend to foreigners, of whom it has been said, that he never took a bribe or perpetrated a "squeeze." The significance of such merits will be understood by all who know anything of a country cursed with that vilest of all governments, a literary bureaucracy.

The pure serenity of this day was followed, as usual, by a brilliantly moon-lit night. Sleep came readily to many to whom the heat of summer nights elsewhere had long denied it, and those who had visited numerous climes, agreed that few possess greater charms than does early autumn in far Eastern China.

CYPRIAN A. G. BRIDGE.

AN AGNOSTIC'S APOLOGY.

AN attempt has recently been made to obtain currency for the new nickname—Agnostic. Protests against nicknames are foolish; foolish because unavailing, and foolish because nicknames are always harmless. A protest in this case would be especially foolish; for the nickname in question seems to indicate a distinct advance in the courtesies of controversy. The old theological phrase for an intellectual opponent was Atheist—a name which still retains a certain flavour as of the stake in this world and hell-fire in the next, and which, moreover, implies an inaccuracy of some importance. Dogmatic Atheism—the doctrine that there is no God, whatever may be meant by God—is, to say the least, a rare phase of opinion. The word Agnosticism, on the other hand, seems to imply a fairly accurate appreciation of a form of creed already common and daily spreading. The Agnostic is one who asserts—what no one denies—that there are limits to the sphere of human intelligence. He asserts, further, what many theologians have expressly maintained, that those limits are such as to exclude at least what Mr. Lewes has so happily called “metempirical” knowledge. But he goes further, and asserts, in opposition to theologians, that theology lies within this forbidden sphere. This last assertion raises the important issue; and, though I have no pretension to invent an opposition nickname, I may venture for the purposes of this article to describe the rival school as Gnostics.

The Gnostic holds that our reason can in some sense transcend the narrow limits of experience. He holds that we can attain truths not capable of verification, and not needing verification, by actual experiment or observation. He holds, further, that a knowledge of those truths is essential to the highest interests of mankind, and enables us in some sort to solve the dark riddle of the universe. A complete solution, as every one admits, is beyond our power. But some answer may be given to the doubts which harass and perplex us when we try to frame any adequate conception of the vast order of which we form an insignificant portion. We cannot say why this or that arrangement is what it is; we can say, though obscurely, that some answer exists, and would be satisfactory if we could only find it. Overpowered, as every honest and serious thinker is at times overpowered, by the sight of pain, folly, and helplessness, by the jarring discords which run through the vast harmony of the universe, we are yet enabled to hear at times a whisper that all is well, to trust to it as coming from the

most authentic source, and to know that only the temporary bars of sense prevent us from recognising with certainty that the harmony beneath the discords is a reality and not a dream. This knowledge is embodied in the central dogma of theology. God is the name of the harmony; and God is knowable. Who would not be happy in accepting this belief, if he could accept it honestly? Who would not be glad if he could say with confidence, the evil is transitory, the good eternal: our doubts are due to limitations destined to be abolished, and the world is really an embodiment of love and wisdom, however dark it may appear to our faculties? And yet, if the so-called knowledge be illusory, are we not bound by the most sacred obligations to recognise the facts? Our brief path is dark enough on any hypothesis. We cannot afford to turn aside every *ignis futurus* without asking whether it leads to sounder footing or to hopeless quagmires. Dreams may be pleasanter for the moment than realities; but happiness must be won by adapting our lives to the realities. And who that has felt the burden of existence, and suffered under well-meant efforts at consolation, will deny that such consolations are the bitterest of mockeries? Pain is not an evil; death is not a separation; sickness is but a blessing in disguise. Have the gloomiest speculations of avowed pessimists ever tortured sufferers like those kindly platitudes? Is there a more cutting piece of satire in the language than the reference in our funeral service to the "sure and certain hope of a blessed resurrection"? To dispel genuine hopes might be painful, however salutary. To suppress these spasmodic efforts to fly in the face of facts would be some comfort even in the distress which they are meant to alleviate.

Besides the important question whether the Gnostic can prove his dogmas, there is therefore the further question whether the dogmas, if granted, have any meaning. Do they answer our doubts or mock us with the appearance of an answer? The Gnostics pride themselves on their knowledge. Have they anything to tell us? They rebuke what they call the "pride of reason" in the name of a still more exalted pride. The scientific reasoner is arrogant because he sets limits to the faculty in which he trusts, and denies the existence of any other faculty. They are humble because they dare to tread in the regions which he declares to be inaccessible. But without bandying such accusations, or asking which pride is the greatest, the Gnostics are at least bound to show some ostensible justification for their complacency. Have they discovered a firm resting-place from which they are entitled to look down in compassion or contempt upon those who hold it to be a mere edifice of moonshine? If they have diminished by a scruple the weight of one passing doubt, we should be grateful: perhaps we should be converts. If not, why condemn Agnosticism?

I have said that our knowledge is in any case limited. I may add that, on any showing, there is a danger in failing to recognise the limits of possible knowledge. The word Gnostic has some awkward associations. It once described certain heretics who got into trouble from fancying that men could frame theories of the Divine mode of existence. The sects have been dead for many centuries. Their fundamental assumptions can hardly be quite extinct. Not long ago, at least, there appeared in the papers a string of propositions framed—so we were assured—by some of the most candid and most learned of living theologians. These propositions defined by the help of various languages the precise relations which exist between the persons of the Trinity. It is an odd, though far from an unprecedented, circumstance that the unbeliever cannot quote them for fear of profanity. If they were transplanted into the pages of the *Fortnightly Review*, it would be impossible to convince any one that the intention was not to mock the simple-minded persons who, we must suppose, were not themselves intentionally irreverent. It is enough to say that they defined the nature of God Almighty with an accuracy from which modest naturalists would shrink in describing the genesis of a black-beetle. I know not whether these dogmas were put forward as articles of faith, as pious conjectures, or as tentative contributions to a sound theory. At any rate, it was supposed that they were interesting to beings of flesh and blood. If so, one can only ask in wonder whether an utter want of reverence is most strongly implied in this mode of dealing with sacred mysteries; or an utter ignorance of, existing state of the world in the assumption that the question which really divides mankind is the double procession of the Holy Ghost; or an utter incapacity for speculation in the confusion of these dead exuvæ of long-past modes of thought with living intellectual tissue; or an utter want of imagination, or of even a rudimentary sense of humour, in the hypothesis that the promulgation of such dogmas could produce anything but the laughter of sceptics and the contempt of the healthy human intellect?

The sect which requires to be encountered in these days is not one which boggles over the *filioque*, but certain successors of those Ephesians who told Paul that they did not even know “whether there were any Holy Ghost.” But it explains some modern phenomena when we find that the leaders of theology hope to reconcile faith and reason, and to show that the old symbols have still a right to the allegiance of our hearts and brains, by putting forth these portentous propositions. We are struggling with hard facts, and they would arm us with the forgotten tools of scholasticism. We wish for spiritual food, and are to be put off with these ancient mummeries of forgotten dogma. If Agnosticism

is the frame of mind which summarily rejects these imbecilities, and would restrain the human intellect from wasting its powers on the attempt to galvanise into sham activity this *caput mortuum* of old theology, nobody need be afraid of the name. Argument against such adversaries would be itself a foolish waste of time. Let the dead bury their dead, and Old Catholics decide whether the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son or from the Father alone. Gentlemen indeed who still read the Athanasian Creed, and profess to attach some meaning to its statements, have no right to sneer at their brethren who persist in taking things seriously. But for men who long for facts instead of phrases, the only possible course is to allow such vagaries to take their own course to the limbo to which they are naturally destined, simply noting, by the way, that modern Gnosticism may lead to puerilities which one blushes even to notice.

It is not with such phenomena that we have seriously to deal. Nobody maintains that the unassisted human intellect can discover the true theory of the Trinity; and the charge of Agnosticism refers, of course, to the sphere of reason, not to the sphere of revelation. Yet those who attack the doctrine are chiefly believers in revelation; and as such they should condescend to answer one important question. Is not the denunciation of reason a commonplace with theologians? What could be easier than to form a catena of the most philosophical defenders of Christianity who have exhausted language in declaring the impotence of the unassisted intellect? Comte has not more explicitly enounced the incapacity of man to deal with the Absolute and the Infinite than a whole series of orthodox writers. Trust your reason, we have been told till we are tired of the phrase, and you will become Atheists or Agnostics. We take you at your word; we become Agnostics. What right have you to turn round and rate us for being a degree more logical than yourselves? Our right, you reply, is founded upon a Divine revelation to ourselves or our church. Let us grant—it is a very liberal concession—that the right may conceivably be established; but still you are at one with us in philosophy. You say as we say that the natural man can know nothing of the Divine nature. That is Agnosticism. Our fundamental principle is not only granted, but asserted. By what logical device you succeed in overleaping the barriers which you have declared to be insuperable is another question. At least you have no *prima facie* ground for attacking our assumption that the limits of the human intellect are what you declare them to be. This is no mere verbal retort. Half, or more than half, of our adversaries agree formally with our leading principle. They cannot attack us without upsetting the very ground upon which the ablest advocates of their own case rely. The last English writer who professed to defend Christianity with weapons drawn from wide and genuine philosophical know-

ledge was Dean Mansel. 'The whole substance of his argument was simply and solely the assertion of the first principles of Agnosticism. Mr. Herbert Spencer, the prophet of the Unknowable, the foremost representative of Agnosticism, professes in his programme to be carrying "a step further the doctrine put into shape by Hamilton and Mansel." Nobody, I suspect, would now deny, nobody except Dean Mansel himself ever denied very seriously, that the "further step" thus taken was the logical step. Opponents both from within and without the Church, Mr. Maurice and Mr. Mill, agreed that this affiliation was legitimate. The Old Testament represents Jehovah as human, as vindictive, as prescribing immoralities; therefore Jehovah was not the true God; that was the contention of the infidel. We know nothing whatever about the true God, was the reply, for God means the Absolute and the Infinite. Any special act may come from God, for it may be a moral miracle; any attribute may represent the character of God to man, for we know nothing whatever of his real attributes, and cannot even conceive Him as endowed with attributes. The doctrine of the Atonement cannot be revolting, because it cannot have any meaning. Mr. Spencer hardly goes a step beyond his original, except, indeed, in candour.

Most believers repudiate Dean Mansel's arguments. They were an anachronism. They were fatal to the decaying creed of pure Theism, and powerless against the growing creed of Agnosticism. When theology had vital power enough to throw out fresh branches, the orthodox could venture to attack the Deist, and the Deist could assail the traditional beliefs. As the impulse grows fainter, it is seen that such a warfare is suicidal. The old rivals must make an alliance against the common enemy. The theologian must appeal for help to the metaphysician whom he reviled. Orthodoxy used to call Spinoza an Atheist; it is now glad to argue that even Spinoza is a witness on its own side. Yet the most genuine theology still avows its hatred of reason and distrusts sham alliances. Dr. Newman is not, like Dean Mansel, a profound metaphysician, but his admirable rhetoric expresses a far finer religious instinct. He feels more keenly if he does not reason so systematically; and the force of one side of his case is undeniable. He holds that the unassisted reason cannot afford a sufficient support for a belief in God. He declares, as innumerable writers of less power have declared, that there is "no medium, in true philosophy, between Atheism and Catholicity, and that a perfectly consistent mind, under those circumstances in which it finds itself here below, must embrace either the one or the other."¹ He looks in vain for any antagonist, except the Catholic Church, capable of baffling and withstanding "the fierce energy of passion, and the all-corroding, all-dissolving scepticism of the intellect in religious matters."² Some such doctrine is in fact but

(1) "History of my Religious Opinions," p. 322-3.

(2) *Ib.* p. 379.

a natural corollary from the doctrine of human corruption held by all genuine theologians. The very basis of orthodox theology is the actual separation of the creation from the creator. In the *Grammar of Assent*, Dr. Newman tells us that we "can only glean from the surface of the world some faint and fragmentary views" of God. "I see," he proceeds, "only a choice of alternatives in view of so critical a fact; either there is no creator or he has disowned his creatures."¹ The absence of God from his own world is the one prominent fact which startles and appals him.* Dr. Newman, of course, does not see or does not admit the obvious consequence. He asserts most emphatically that he believes in the existence of God as firmly as in his own existence; and he finds the ultimate proof of this doctrine—a proof not to be put into mood and figure—in the testimony of the conscience. But he apparently admits that Atheism is as logical, that is, as free from self-contradiction, as Catholicism. He certainly declares that though the ordinary arguments are conclusive, they are not in practice convincing. Sound reason would of course establish theology; but corrupt man does not and cannot reason soundly. Dr. Newman, however, goes further than this. His Theism can only be supported by help of his Catholicity. If, therefore, Dr. Newman had never heard of the Catholic Church, if, that is, he were in the position of the great majority of men now living, and of the overwhelming majority of the race which has lived since its first appearance, he would be driven to one of two alternatives. Either he would be an Atheist or he would be an Agnostic. His conscience might say, there is a God; his observation would say, there is no God. Moreover, the voice of conscience has been very differently interpreted. Dr. Newman's interpretation has no force for any one who, like most men, does not share his intuitions. To such persons, therefore, there can be, on Dr. Newman's own showing, no refuge except the admittedly logical refuge of Atheism. Even if they shared his intuitions they would be necessarily sceptics until the Catholic Church came to their aid, for their intuitions would be in hopeless conflict with their experience. I need hardly add that, to some minds, the proposed alliance with reason of a Church which admits that its tenets are corroded and dissolved wherever free reason is allowed to play upon them, is rather suspicious. At any rate, Dr. Newman's arguments go to prove that man, as guided by reason, ought to be an Agnostic, and that, at the present moment, Agnosticism is the only reasonable faith for at least three-quarters of the race.

All, then, who think that men should not be dogmatic about matters beyond the sphere of reason or even conceivability, who hold that reason, however weak, is our sole guide, or who find that their conscience does not testify to the divinity of the Catholic God, but declares the

(1) "*Grammar of Assent*," p. 392.

moral doctrines of Catholicity to be demonstrably erroneous, are entitled to claim such orthodox writers as sharing their fundamental principles, though refusing to draw the legitimate inferences. The authority of Dean Mansel and Dr. Newman may of course be repudiated. In one sense, however, they are simply stating an undeniable fact. The race collectively is agnostic, whatever may be the case with individuals. Newton might be certain of the truth of his doctrines whilst other thinkers were convinced of their falsity. It could not be said that the doctrines were certainly true, so long as they were doubted in good faith by competent reasoners. Dr. Newman may be as much convinced of the truth of his theology as Mr. Huxley of its error. But speaking of the race and not of the individual, there is no plainer fact in history than the fact that hitherto no knowledge has been attained. There is not a single proof of natural theology of which the negative has not been maintained as vigorously as the affirmative. The fact is notorious.

You tell us to be ashamed of professing ignorance. Where is the shame of ignorance in matters still involved in endless and hopeless controversy? Is it not rather a duty? Why should a lad who has just run the gauntlet of examinations and escaped to a country parsonage be dogmatic, when his dogmas are denounced as erroneous by half the philosophers of the world? What theory of the universe am I to accept as demonstrably established? At the very earliest dawn of philosophy men were divided by earlier forms of the same problems which divide them now. Shall I be a Platonist or an Aristotelian? a nominalist or a realist? Shall I admit or deny the existence of innate ideas? Shall I believe in the possibility or in the impossibility of transcending experience? Go to the mediæval philosophy, says one smart controversialist. To which mediæval philosophy, pray? And why should I believe you rather than the great thinkers of the seventeenth century, who agreed with one accord that the first condition of intellectual progress was the destruction of that philosophy? There would be no difficulty if it were a question of physical science. I might believe in Galileo and Newton and their successors down to Adams and Leverrier without hesitation, because they all substantially agree. But when men deal with the old problems there are still the old doubts. Shall I believe in Hobbes or in Descartes? Can I stop where Descartes stopped, or must I go on to Spinoza? Or shall I follow Locke's guidance, and end with Hume's scepticism? Or listen to Kant, and, if so, shall I decide that he is right in destroying theology or in reconstructing it, or in both performances? Does Hegel hold the key of the secret, or is he a mere spinner of jargon? May not Feuerbach or Schopenhauer represent the true development of metaphysical inquiry? Shall I put faith in Hamilton and Mansel, and, if so,

shall I read their conclusions by the help of Mr. Spencer, or shall I believe in Mill or in Mr. Lewes? State any one proposition in which all philosophers agree, and I will admit it to be true; or any one which has a manifest balance of authority, and I will agree that it is probable. But so long as every philosopher flatly contradicts the first principles of his predecessors, why affect certainty? The only agreement I can discover is, that there is no philosopher of whom his opponents have not said that his opinions lead logically either to Pantheism or to Atheism.

When all the witnesses thus contradict each other, the *prima facie* result is pure scepticism. There is no certainty. Who am I, if I were the ablest of modern thinkers, to say summarily that all the great men who differed from me are wrong, and so wrong that their difference should not even raise a doubt in my mind? From such scepticism there is indeed one, and, so far as I can see, but one, escape. The very hopelessness of the controversy shows that the reasoners have been transcending the limits of reason. They have reached a point where, as at the pole, the compass points indifferently to every quarter. Thus there is a chance that I may retain what is valuable in the chaos of speculation, and reject what is bewildering by confining the mind to its proper limits. But has any limit ever been suggested, except a limit which comes in substance to an exclusion of all ontology? In short, if I would avoid utter scepticism, must I not be an Agnostic?

Let us suppose, however, that this difficulty can be evaded. Suppose that, after calling witnesses from all schools and all ages, I can find ground for excluding all the witnesses who make against me. Let me say, for example, that the whole school which refuses to transcend experience errs from the wickedness of its heart and the consequent dulness of its intellect. Some people seem to think that a plausible and happy suggestion. Let the theologian have his necessary laws of thought, which enable him to evolve truth beyond all need of verification from experience. Where will the process end? The question answers itself. The path has been trodden again and again till it is as familiar as the first rule of arithmetic. Admit that the mind can reason about the Absolute and the Infinite, and you will get to Spinoza. No refutation of his arguments, starting from his premisses, has ever been even apparently successful. In fact, the chain of reasoning is substantially too short and simple to be for a moment doubtful. Theology, if logical, leads straight to Pantheism. The Infinite God is everything. All things are bound together as cause and effect. God, the first cause, is the cause of all effects down to the most remote. In one form or other, that is the conclusion to which all theology approximates as it is pushed to its legitimate result.

Here, then, we have an apparent triumph over Agnosticism. But nobody can accept Spinoza without rejecting all the doctrines for which the Gnostics really contend. In the first place, revelation and the God of revelation disappears. The argument according to Spinoza against supernaturalism differs from the argument according to Hume in being more peremptory. Hume only denies that a past miracle can be proved by evidence: Spinoza denies that it could ever have happened. As a fact, miracles and a local revelation were first assailed by Deists more effectually than by sceptics. The old Theology was seen to be unworthy of the God of nature, before it was said that nature could not be regarded through the theological representation. And, in the next place, the orthodox assault upon the value of Pantheism is irresistible. Pantheism can give no ground for morality, for nature is as much the cause of vice as the cause of virtue; it can give no ground for an optimist view of the universe, for nature causes evil as much as it causes good. We no longer doubt, it is true, whether there be a God, for our God means all reality; but every doubt which we entertained about the universe is transferred to the God upon whom the universe is moulded. The attempt to transfer to pure being or to the abstraction Nature the feelings with which we are taught to regard a person of transcendent wisdom and benevolence is, as theologians assert, hopeless. To deny the existence of God is in this sense the same as to deny the existence of no-God. We keep the old word; we have altered the whole of its contents. A Pantheist is, as a rule, one who looks upon the universe through his feelings instead of his reason, and who regards it with love because his habitual frame of mind is amiable. But he has no logical argument as against the Pessimist, who regards it with dread unqualified by love, or the Agnostic, who finds it impossible to regard it with any but a colourless emotion.

The Gnostic, then, gains nothing by admitting the claims of a faculty which at once overturns his conclusions. His second step is invariably to half-retract his first. We are bound by a necessary law of thought, he tells us, to believe in universal causation. Very well, then let us be Pantheists. No, he says; another necessary law of thought tells us that causation is not universal. We know that the will is free, or, in other words, that the class of phenomena most important to us are not caused. This is the position of the ordinary Deist; and it is of vital importance to him, for otherwise the connection between Deism and morality is, on his own ground, untenable. The ablest and most logical thinkers have declared that the freewill doctrine involves a fallacy, and have unravelled the fallacy to their own satisfaction. Whether right or wrong, they have at least this advantage, that, on their showing, reason is on this point consistent with itself. The advocate of freewill, on the

other hand, declares that an insoluble antinomy occurs at the very threshold of his speculations. An uncaused phenomenon is unthinkable; yet consciousness testifies that our actions, so far as they are voluntary, are uncaused. In face of such a contradiction, the only rational state of mind is scepticism. A mind balanced between two necessary and contradictory thoughts must be in a hopeless state of doubt. The Gnostic, therefore, starts by proclaiming that we must all be Agnostics in regard to a matter of primary philosophical importance. If by freewill he means anything else than a denial of causation, his statement is irrelevant.

For, it must be noticed, this is not one of the refined speculative problems which may be neglected in our ordinary reasoning. The ancient puzzles about the one and the many, or the infinite and the finite, may or may not be insoluble. They do not affect our practical knowledge. Familiar difficulties have been raised as to our conceptions of motion: the hare and tortoise problem may be revived by modern metaphysicians; but the mathematician may continue to calculate the movements of the planets and never doubt whether the quicker body will in fact overtake the slower. The freewill problem cannot be thus shirked. We all admit that a competent reasoner can foretell the motions of the moon; and we admit it because we know that there is no element of objective chance in the problem. But the determinist asserts whilst the libertarian denies that it would be possible for an adequate intelligence to foretell the actions of a man or a race. There is or is not an element of objective chance in the question; and whether there is or is not must be decided by reason and observation, independently of those puzzles about the infinite and the finite which affect equally the man and the planet. The anti-determinist asserts the existence of chance so positively, that he doubts whether God himself can foretell the future of humanity; or, at least he is unable to reconcile Divine prescience with his favourite doctrine.

In most practical questions, indeed, the difference is of little importance. The believer in freewill admits that we can make an approximate guess; the determinist admits that our faculty of calculation is limited. But when we turn to the problems with which the Gnostic desires to deal, the problem is of primary importance. Freewill is made responsible for all the moral evil in the world. God made man perfect, but he gave his creature freewill. The exercise of that freewill has converted the world into a scene in which the most striking fact, as Dr Newman tells us, is the absence of the Creator. It follows, then, that all this evil, the sight of which leads some of us to Atheism, some to blank despair, and some to epicurean indifference, and the horror of which is at the root of every vigorous religious creed, results from accident. If

even God could have foretold it, he foretold it in virtue of faculties inconceivable to finite minds; and no man, however exalted his faculties, could by any possibility have foretold it. Here, then, is Agnosticism in the highest degree. An inexorable necessity of thought makes it absolutely impossible for us to say whether this world is the anteroom to heaven or hell. We do not know, nay, it is intrinsically impossible for us to know, whether the universe is to be a source of endless felicity or a ghastly and everlasting torture-house. The Gnostic invites us to rejoice because the existence of an infinitely good and wise Creator is a guarantee for our happiness. He adds in the same breath that this good and wise being has left it to chance whether his creatures shall all, or in any proportion, go straight to the devil. He reviles the Calvinist, who dares to think that God has settled the point by his arbitrary will. Is an arbitrary decision better or worse than a trusting to chance? We know that there is a great First Cause; but we add that there are at this moment in the world some twelve hundred million little first causes which may damn or save themselves as they please.

The freewill hypothesis is the device by which theologians try to relieve God of the responsibility for the sufferings of his creation. It is required for another purpose. It enables the Creator to be also the judge. Man must be partly independent of God, or God would be at once pulling the wires and punishing the puppets. So far the argument is unimpeachable; but the device justifies God at the expense of making the universe a moral chaos. Grant the existence of this arbitrary force called freewill, and we shall be forced to admit that, if justice is to be found anywhere, it is at least not to be found in this strange anarchy, where chance and fate are struggling for the mastery.

The fundamental proposition of the anti-determinist, that which contains the whole pith and substance of his teaching, is this: that a determined action cannot be meritorious. Desert can only accrue in respect of actions which are self-caused, or in so far as they are self-caused; and self-caused is merely a periphrasis for uncaused. Now no one dares to say that our conduct is entirely self-caused. The assumption is implied in every act of our lives and every speculation about history that men's actions are determined, exclusively or to a great extent, by their character and their circumstances. Only so far as that doctrine is true can human nature be the subject of any reasoning whatever; for reason is but the reflection of external regularity, and vanishes with the admission of chance. Our conduct, then, is the resultant of the two forces which we may call fate and freewill. Fate is but a name for the will of God. He is responsible for placing us with a certain character in a certain position; he cannot justly punish us for the consequences; we are

responsible to him for the effects of our freewill alone, if freewill exists. That is the very contention of the anti-determinist; let us look for a moment at the consequences.

The ancient difficulty which has perplexed men since the days of Job is this: Why are happiness and misery arbitrarily distributed? Why do the good so often suffer and the evil so often flourish? The difficulty, says the determinist, arises entirely from applying the conception of justice where it is manifestly out of place. The advocate of freewill refuses this escape, and is perplexed by a further difficulty. Why are virtue and vice arbitrarily distributed? Of all the puzzles of this dark world, or of all forms of the one great puzzle, the most appalling is that which meets us at the corner of every street. Look at the children growing up amidst moral poison; see the brothel and the public-house turning out harlots and drunkards by the thousand; at the brutalized elders preaching cruelty and shamelessness by example; and deny, if you can, that lust and brutality are generated as certainly as scrofula and typhus. Nobody dares to deny it. All philanthropists admit it; and every hope of improvement is based on the assumption that the moral character is determined by its surroundings. What does the theological advocate of freewill say to reconcile such a spectacle with our moral conceptions? Will God damn all these wretches for faults due to causes as much beyond their power as the shape of their limbs or as the orbits of the planets? Or will he make some allowance, and decline to ask for grapes from thistles, and exact purity of life from beings born in corruption, breathing corruption, and trained in corruption? Let us try each alternative.

To Job's difficulty it has been replied that, though virtue is not always rewarded and vice punished, yet virtue *as such* is rewarded, and vice *as such* is punished. If that be true, God, on the freewill hypothesis, must be unjust. Virtue and vice, as the facts irresistibly prove, are caused by fate or by God's will as well as by freewill, that is, our own will. To punish a man brought up in a London slum by the rule applicable to a man brought up at the feet of Christ is manifestly the height of justice. Nay, for anything we can tell, for we know nothing of the circumstances of their birth and education, the effort which Judas Iscariot exerted in restoring the price of blood may have required a greater force of freewill than would have saved Peter from denying his master. Moll Flanders may put forth more power to keep out of the lowest depths of vice than a girl brought up in a convent to kill herself by ascetic austerities. If, in short, reward is proportioned to virtue, it cannot be proportioned to merit; for merit, by the hypothesis, is proportioned to the freewill, which is only one of the factors of virtue. The apparent injustice may, of course, be remedied by some un-

knowable compensation; but for all that appears, it is the height of injustice to reward equally equal attainments under entirely different conditions. In other words, the theologian has raised a difficulty from which he can only escape by the help of Agnosticism. Justice is not to be found in the visible arrangements of the universe.

Let us, then, take the other alternative. Assume that rewards are proportioned not to virtue but to merit. God will judge us by what we have done for ourselves, not by the tendencies which he has impressed upon us. The difficulty is disguised, for it is not diminished, and morality is degraded. A man should be valued, say all the deepest moralists, by his nature, not by his external acts; by what he is, not by how he came to be what he is. Virtue is heaven, and vice is hell. Divine rewards and punishments are not arbitrarily annexed, but represent the natural state of a being brought into harmony with the supreme law, or in hopeless conflict with it. We need a change of nature, not a series of acts unconnected with our nature. Virtue is a reality precisely in so far as it is a part of nature, not of accident; of our fate, not of our freewill. The assertion in some shape of these truths has been at the bottom of all great moral and religious reforms. The attempt to patch up some compromise between this and the opposite theory has generated those endless controversies about grace and freewill on which no Christian church has ever been able to make up its mind, and which warn us that we are once more plunging into Agnosticism. In order to make the Creator the judge, you assume that part of man's actions are his own. Only on that showing can he have merit as against his Maker. Admitting this, and only if we admit this, we get a footing for the debtor and creditor theories of morality—for the doctrine that man runs up a score with heaven in respect of that part of his conduct which is uncaused. Thus we have a ground for the various theories of merit by which priests have thriven and churches been corrupted; but it is at the cost of splitting human nature in two, and making happiness depend upon those acts which are not really part of our true selves.

It is not, however, my purpose to show the immorality or the unreasonableness of the doctrine. I shall only remark that it is essentially agnostic. Only in so far as phenomena embody fixed "laws" can we have any ground for inference in this world, and, *a fortiori*, from this world to the next. If happiness is the natural consequence of virtue, we may plausibly argue that the virtuous will be happy hereafter. If heaven be a bonus arbitrarily bestowed upon the exercise of an inscrutable power, all analogies break down. The merit of an action as between men depends upon the motives. The actions for which God rewards and punishes are the actions or those parts of actions which are independent of motive. Punish-

ment amongst men is regulated by some considerations of its utility to the criminal or his fellows. No conceivable measure of Divine punishment can even be suggested when once we distinguish between divine and natural; and the very essence of the theory is that such a distinction exists. For whatever may be true of the next world, we begin by assuming that new principles are to be called into play hereafter. The new world is summoned into being to redress the balance of the old. The fate which here too often makes the good miserable and the bad happy, which still more strangely fetters our wills and forces the strong will into wickedness and strengthens the weak will to goodness, will then be suspended. The motive which induces us to believe in the good arrangement hereafter is precisely the badness of this. Such a motive to belief cannot itself be a reason for belief. We believe because it is unreasonable. This world, once more, is a chaos, in which the most conspicuous fact is the absence of the Creator. Nay, it is so chaotic that, according to theologians, infinite rewards and penalties are required to square the account and redress the injustice here accumulated. What is this, so far as the natural reason is concerned, but the very superlative of Agnosticism? The appeal to experience can lead to nothing, for our very object is to contradict experience. We appeal to facts to show that facts are illusory. The appeal to *a priori* reason is not more hopeful, for you begin by showing that reason on these matters is self-contradictory, and you insist that human nature is radically irregular, and therefore beyond the sphere of reason. If you could succeed in deducing any theory by reason, reason would, on your showing, be at hopeless issue with experience.

There are two questions, in short, about the universe which must be answered to escape from Agnosticism. The great fact which puzzles the mind is the vast amount of evil. It may be answered that evil is an illusion, because God is benevolent; or it may be answered that evil is deserved, because God is just. In one case the doubt is removed by denying the existence of the difficulty, in the other it is made tolerable by satisfying our consciences. We have seen what natural reason can do towards justifying these answers. To escape from Agnosticism we become Pantheists; then the divine reality must be the counterpart of phenomenal nature, and all the difficulties recur. We escape from Pantheism by the illogical device of freewill. Then God is indeed good and wise, but God is no longer omnipotent. By his side we erect a fetish called freewill, which is potent enough to defeat all God's good purposes, and to make his absence from his own universe the most conspicuous fact given by observation; and which, at the same time, is by its own nature intrinsically arbitrary in its action. Your Gnosticism tells us that an almighty benevolence is watching over everything, and bringing good

out of all evil. Whence, then, comes the evil? By freewill; that is, by chance! It is an exception, an exception which covers, say, half the phenomena, and includes all that puzzle us. Say boldly at once no explanation can be given, and then proceed to denounce Agnosticism. If, again, we take the moral problem, the Pantheist view shows desert as before God to be a contradiction in terms. We are what he has made us; nay, we are but manifestations of himself—how can he complain? Escape from the dilemma by making us independent of God, and God, so far as the observed universe can tell us, becomes systematically unjust. He rewards the good and the bad, and gives equal reward to the free agent and the slave of fate. Where are we to turn for a solution?

Let us turn to revelation; that is the most obvious reply. By all means, though this is to admit that natural reason cannot help us; or, in other words, directly produces more Agnosticism, though indirectly it makes an opening for revelation. There is, indeed, a difficulty here. Pure theism, as we have observed, is in reality as vitally opposed to historical revelation as simple scepticism. The word God is used by the metaphysician and the savage. It may mean anything from "pure Being" down to the most degraded fetish. The "universal consent" is a consent to use the same phrase for antagonistic conceptions—for order and chaos, for absolute unity or utter heterogeneity, for a universe governed by a human will or by a will of which man cannot form the slightest conception. This is of course a difficulty which runs off the orthodox disputant like water from a duck's back. He appeals to his conscience, and his conscience tells him just what he wants. It reveals a Being just at that point in the scale between the two extremes which is convenient for his purposes. I open, for example, a harmless little treatise by a divine who need not be named. He knows intuitively, so he says, that there is a God, who is benevolent and wise, and endowed with personality, that is to say, conceived anthropomorphically enough to be capable of acting upon the universe, and yet so far different from man as to be able to throw a decent veil of mystery over his more questionable actions. Well, I reply, my intuition tells me of no such being. Then, says the divine, I can't prove my statements, but you would recognise their truth if your heart or your intellect were not corrupted: that is, you must be a knave or a fool. This is a kind of argument to which one is perfectly accustomed in theology. I am right, and you are wrong; and I am right because I am good and wise. By all means; and now let us see what your wisdom and goodness can tell us.

The Christian revelation makes statements which, if true, are undoubtedly of the very highest importance. God is angry with man. Unless we believe and repent we shall all be damned. It is

impossible, indeed, for its advocates even to say this without instantly contradicting themselves. Their doctrine frightens them. They explain in various ways that a great many people will be saved without believing, and that eternal damnation is not eternal nor damnation. It is only the vulgar who hold such views, and who, of course, must not be disturbed in them; but they are not for the intelligent. God grants "uncovenanted mercies"—that is, he sometimes lets a sinner off, though he has not made a legal bargain about it—an explanation calculated to exalt our conceptions of the Deity! But let us pass over these endless shufflings from the horrible to the meaningless. Christianity tells us in various ways how the wrath of the Creator may be appeased and his goodwill ensured. The doctrine is manifestly important to believers; but does it give us a clearer or happier view of the universe? That is what is required for the confusion of Agnostics; and, if the mystery were in part solved, or the clouds thinned in the slightest degree, Christianity would triumph by its inherent merits. Let us then ask once more, Does Christianity exhibit the ruler of their universe as benevolent or as just?

If I were to assert that of every ten beings born into this world nine would be damned, that all who refused to believe what they did not hold to be proved, and all who sinned from overwhelming temptation, and all who had not had the good fortune to be the subjects of a miraculous conversion or the recipients of a grace conveyed by a magical charm, would be tortured to all eternity, what would an orthodox theologian reply? He could not say, "That is false;" I might appeal to the highest authorities for my justification; nor, in fact, could he on his own showing deny the possibility. Hell, he says, exists; he does not know who will be damned; though he does know that all men are by nature corrupt and liable to be damned if not saved by supernatural grace. He might, and probably would, now say, "That is rash. You have no authority for saying how many will be lost and how many saved: you cannot even say what is meant by hell or heaven: you cannot tell how far God may be better than his word, though you may be sure that he won't be worse than his word." And what is all this but to say, We know nothing about it? In other words, to fall back on Agnosticism? The difficulty, as theologians truly say, is not so much that evil is eternal, as that evil exists. That is in substance a frank admission that, as nobody can explain evil, nobody can explain anything. Your revelation, which was to prove the benevolence of God, has proved only that God's benevolence may be consistent with the eternal and infinite misery of most of his creatures; you escape only by saying that it is also consistent with their not being eternally and infinitely miserable. That is, the revelation reveals nothing.

But the revelation shows God to be just. Now, if the freewill

hypothesis be rejected—and it is rejected not only by infidels but by the most consistent theologians—this question cannot really arise at all. Jonathan Edwards will prove that there cannot be a question of justice as between man and God. The creature has no rights against his Creator. The question of justice merges in the question of benevolence; and Edwards will go on to say that most men are damned, and that the blessed will thank God for their tortures. That is logical, but not consoling. Passing this over, can revelation prove that God is just, assuming that justice is a word applicable to dealings between the potter and the pot?

And here we are sent to the “great argument of Butler.” Like some other theological arguments already noticed, that great argument is to many minds—that of James Mill, for example—a direct assault upon Theism, or, in other words, an argument for Agnosticism. Briefly stated, it comes to this. The God of revelation cannot be the God of nature, said the Deists, because the God of revelation is unjust. The God of revelation, replied Butler, may be the God of nature, for the God of nature is unjust. Stripped of its various involutions, that is the sum and substance of this celebrated piece of reasoning. Butler, I must say in passing, deserves high credit for two things. The first is, that he is the only theologian who has ever had the courage to admit that any difficulty existed when he was struggling most desperately to meet the difficulty; though even Butler could not admit that such a difficulty should affect a man's conduct. Secondly, Butler's argument really rests upon a moral theory, mistaken indeed in some senses, but possessing a stoical grandeur. To admit, however, that Butler was a noble and a comparatively candid thinker, is not to admit that he ever faced the real difficulty. It need not be asked here by what means he evaded it. His position is in any case plain. Christianity tells us, as he thinks, that God damns men for being bad, whether they could help it or not; and that he lets them off, or lets some of them off, for the sufferings of others. He damns the helpless and punishes the innocent. Horrible! exclaims the infidel. Possibly, replies Butler, but nature is just as bad. All suffering is punishment. It strikes the good as well as the wicked. The father sins, and the son suffers. I drink too much, and my son has the gout. In another world, we may suppose that the same system will be carried out more thoroughly. God will pardon some sinners because he punished Christ, and he will damn others everlastingly. That is his way. A certain degree of wrongdoing here leads to irremediable suffering, or rather to suffering remediable by death alone. In the next world there is no death; therefore the suffering won't be remediable at all. The world is a scene of probation, destined to fit us for a better life. As a matter of fact, most men make it a discipline of vice instead of a discipline of virtue; and most men, therefore, will presumably be damned. We see the same

thing in the waste of seeds and animal life, and may suppose, therefore, that it is part of the general scheme of Providence.

This is the Christian revelation according to Butler. Does it make the world better? Does it not rather add indefinitely to the terror produced by the sight of all its miseries, and justify James Mill for feeling that rather than such a God he would have no God? What escape can be suggested? The obvious one; it is all a mystery; and what is mystery but the theological phrase for Agnosticism? God has spoken and endorsed all our most hideous doubts. He has said, let there be light, and there is no light—no light but rather darkness visible, serving only to discover sights of woe.

The believers who desire to soften away the old dogmas—in other words, to take refuge from the unpleasant results of their doctrine with the Agnostics, and to retain the pleasant results with the Gnostics—have a different mode of escape. They know that God is good and just; that evil will somehow disappear and apparent injustice be somehow redressed. The practical objection to this amiable creed suggests a sad comment upon the whole controversy. We fly to religion to escape from our dark forebodings. But a religion which stifles those forebodings always fails to satisfy us. We long to hear that they are groundless. Directly we are told that they are groundless, we distrust our authority. No poetry lives which reflects only the cheerful emotions. Our sweetest songs are those which tell of saddest thought. We can bring harmony out of melancholy; we cannot banish melancholy from the world. And the religious utterances, which are the highest form of poetry, are bound by the same law. There is a deep sadness in the world. Turn and twist the thought as you may, there is no escape. Optimism would be soothing if it were possible; in fact, it is impossible, and therefore a constant mockery; and of all dogmas that ever were invented, that which has least vitality is the dogma that whatever is, is right.

Let us, however, consider for a moment what is the net result of this pleasant creed. Its philosophical basis may be sought in pure reason or in experience; but, as a rule, its adherents are ready to admit that the pure reason requires the support of the emotions before such a doctrine can be established, and are therefore marked by a certain tinge of mysticism. They feel rather than know. The awe with which they regard the universe, the tender glow of reverence and love with which the bare sight of nature affects them, is to them the ultimate guarantee of their beliefs. Happy those who feel such emotions! Only when they try to extract definite statements of fact from these impalpable sentiments they should beware how far such statements are apt to come into terrible collision with reality. And, meanwhile, those who have been disabused with *Candide*, who

have felt the weariness and pain of all "this unintelligible world," and have not been able to escape into any mystic rapture, have as much to say for their own version of the facts. Is happiness a dream, or misery; or is it all a dream? Does not our answer vary with our health and with our condition? When, rapt in the security of a happy life, we cannot even conceive that our happiness will fail, we are practical optimists. When some random blow out of the dark crushes the pillars round which our life has been entwined as recklessly as a boy sweeps away a cobweb, when at a single step we plunge through the flimsy crust of happiness into the deep gulphs beneath, we are tempted to turn to pessimism. Who shall decide, and how? Of all questions that can be asked, the most important is surely this: Is the tangled web of this world composed chiefly of happiness or of misery? and of all questions that can be asked, it is surely the most unanswerable. For in no other problem is the difficulty of discarding the illusions arising from our own experience, of eliminating "the personal error" and gaining an outside standing-point, so hopeless.

In any case, the real appeal must be to experience. Ontologists may manufacture libraries of jargon without touching the point. They have never made or suggested the barest possibility of making a bridge from the world of pure reason to the contingent world in which we live. To the thinker who tries to construct the universe out of pure reason, the actual existence of error in our minds and disorder in the outside world presents a difficulty as hopeless as that which the existence of vice and misery presents to the optimist who tries to construct the universe out of pure goodness. To say that misery does not exist is to contradict the primary testimony of consciousness; to argue on *à priori* grounds that misery or happiness predominates is as hopeless a task as to deduce from the principle of the excluded middle the distance from St. Paul's to Westminster Abbey. Questions of fact can only be solved by examining facts. Perhaps such evidence would show, and if a guess were worth anything, I should add that I guess that it would show, that happiness predominates over misery in the composition of the known world. I am, therefore, not prejudiced against the Gnostic's conclusion; but I add that the evidence is just as open to me as to him. The whole world in which we live may be an illusion—a veil to be withdrawn in some higher state of being. But be it what it may, it supplies all the evidence upon which we can rely. If evil predominates here, we have no reason to suppose that good predominates elsewhere. All the ingenuity of theologians can never shake our conviction that facts are what we feel them to be, nor invert the plain inference from facts; and facts are just as open to one school of thought as to another.

What, then, is the net result? One insoluble doubt has haunted men's minds since thought began in the world. No answer has ever been suggested. One school of philosophers hands it to the next. It is denied in one form only to reappear in another. The question is not which system excludes the doubt, but how it expresses the doubt. Admit or deny the competence of reason in theory, we all agree that it fails in practice. Theologians revile reason as much as Agnostics; they then appeal to it and it decides against them. They amend their plea by excluding certain questions from its jurisdiction, and those questions include the whole difficulty. They go to revelation, and revelation replies by calling doubt mystery. They declare that their consciousness declares just what they want it to declare. Ours declares something else. Who is to decide? The only appeal is to experience, and to appeal to experience is to admit the fundamental dogma of Agnosticism.

Is it not, then, the very height of audacity, in face of a difficulty, which meets us at every turn, which has perplexed all the ablest thinkers in proportion to their ability, which vanishes in one shape only to show itself in another, to declare roundly, not only that the difficulty can be solved, but that it does not exist? Why, when no honest man will deny in private that every ultimate problem is wrapped in the profoundest mystery, do honest men proclaim in pulpits that unhesitating certainty is the duty of the most foolish and ignorant? Is it not a spectacle to make the angels laugh? We are a company of ignorant beings, feeling our way through mists and darkness, learning only by incessantly repeated blunders, obtaining a glimmering of truth by falling into every conceivable error, dimly discerning light enough for our daily needs, but hopelessly differing whenever we attempt to describe the ultimate origin or end of our paths; and yet, when one of us ventures to declare that we don't know the map of the universe as well as the map of our infinitesimal parish, he is hooted, reviled, and perhaps told that he will be damned to all eternity for his faithlessness. Amidst all the endless and hopeless controversies which have left nothing but bare husks of meaningless words, we have been able to discover certain reliable truths. They don't take us very far, and the condition of discovering them has been distrust of *a priori* guesses, and the systematic interrogation of experience. Let us, say some of us, follow at least this clue. Here we shall find sufficient guidance for the needs of life, though we renounce for ever the attempt to get behind the veil which no one has succeeded in raising; if, indeed, there be anything behind. You miserable Agnostics! is the retort; throw aside such rubbish, and cling to the old husks. Stick to the words which profess to explain everything; call your doubts mysteries and they won't disturb you any longer; and

believe in those necessary truths of which no two philosophers have ever succeeded in giving the same version.

Gentlemen, we can only reply, wait till you have some show of agreement amongst yourselves. Wait till you can give some answer, not palpably a verbal answer, to some one of the doubts which oppress us as they oppress you. Wait till you can point to some single truth, however trifling, which has been discovered by your method, and will stand the test of discussion and verification. Wait till you can appeal to reason without in the same breath vilifying reason. Wait till your divine revelations have something more to reveal than the hope that the hideous doubts which they suggest may possibly be without foundation. Till then, we shall be content to admit openly what you whisper under your breath or hide in technical jargon, that the ancient secret is a secret still; that man knows nothing of the Infinite and Absolute; and that, knowing nothing, he had better not be dogmatic about his ignorance. And, meanwhile, we will endeavour to be as charitable as possible, and whilst you trumpet forth officially your contempt for our scepticism, we will at least try to believe that you are imposed upon by your own bluster.

LESLIE STEPHEN.

JAMES NORTHCOTE, R.A.

IN his Life of Reynolds, Northcote tells an interesting story of the great painter. Soon after he came to London, he went to a picture sale. The room was crowded, the business was going on briskly. Suddenly, there was a pause, a flutter at the door, and then the company divided, to make a lane for a great man to approach the auctioneer's rostrum. The great man was Mr. Pope. As he passed up the room he shook hands with the persons nearest him. Reynolds, who was in the second rank, put out his hand, the poet took it, and Sir Joshua used to relate in after-life that this was the only time he saw Mr. Pope, and how much he treasured the memory of that shake of the hand. In the same book, Northcote tells a somewhat similar story of himself. When he was a boy of sixteen, Sir Joshua Reynolds and Dr. Johnson came on a visit to Plymouth. It was in 1762. "It was about this time," he says, "that I first saw Sir Joshua. I had seen several of his works which were in Plymouth (for at that time I had never been out of the county), and these pictures filled me with wonder and delight, although I was then very young; insomuch that I remember when Reynolds was pointed out to me at a public meeting, where a great crowd were assembled, I got as near to him as I could from the pressure of the people, to touch the skirt of his coat, which I did with great satisfaction to my mind." It was a genuine case of hero-worship, which lasted throughout Northcote's life. He begins at sixteen with touching the skirts of Sir Joshua's coat; seventy years afterwards, when he is dying of old age, almost his last words are praises of Sir Joshua.

There was a long interval, however, between this first contact with Reynolds and the close association with him which afterwards marked the lives of the two painters. Northcote had to struggle very hard with adverse fortune, narrow means, and restricted opportunities. His father was a watch and clock-maker in Market Street, Plymouth Dock. He was poor—so poor indeed, that, as Allan Cunningham relates, it was said by the members of a little club to which he belonged, that in his supper with them he took his dinner. James, his second son, was born on the 22nd of October, 1746. Even in boyhood he had a liking for painting, but as this taste developed, it was repressed by the elder Northcote, who intended the lad to be his own apprentice. He was a dissenter, too—a Unitarian—and in those days, Art did not stand well in the estimation of persons of his class or creed. Besides, he had views of life, and made estimates of character. "My father used to say," Northcote tells us, "that there were people of premature ability

who soon ran to seed. He had known several who were very clever at seventeen or eighteen, but who turned out nothing afterwards; at that time of life the effervescence and intoxication of youth did a great deal, but we required to wait till the gaiety and dance of the animal spirits subsided, to see what people really were." Whatever his motive, the old man made Northcote wait. He apprenticed him to the watch-making, and allowed him to paint only in the evening and morning hours of leisure. Northcote submitted, and persevered. He served out his term of apprenticeship, and continued to work at his father's business until he was twenty-four years old—painting, meanwhile, as much as he could; confining himself chiefly to portraits, and studies of animals.

In 1771 his chance came to him. His portraits were talked about in Plymouth; people spoke of him as a prodigy; and then Dr. Mudge, the friend of Reynolds and of Johnson, encouraged him to go to London to see Sir Joshua, giving him a letter of introduction for that purpose. Northcote went at once. It is said that he walked the whole distance from Plymouth to London; and it would seem that at first he made little progress in his great desire. Reynolds shook his head at the crude performances of the young man, and Northcote had to seek employment—that of colouring prints of flowers at a shilling a sheet—to get bread. He was persevering, and did it, contriving to improve his knowledge of Art at the same time, until Reynolds, struck with his determination, took him as a pupil and assistant, not only into his studio, but as a resident in his house.

"It was in the year 1771," says Northcote (in his *Life of Reynolds*), "that I was first placed under the tuition of Sir Joshua Reynolds, to whom I was introduced and strongly recommended by my good and much respected friend, Dr. John Mudge. I feel it next to impossible to express the pleasure I received in breathing, if it may be so said, in an atmosphere of Art; and as from the earliest period of my being able to make any observation, I had conceived him to be the greatest painter that ever lived, it may be conjectured what I felt when I found myself in his house as his scholar."

It was a good house to be in: a house in which there was the best Art and the best company—Johnson, and Goldsmith, and Burke, and Garrick; the wits and the poets, politicians and painters, rank and fashion, and, above all, Sir Joshua himself, sovereign in Art, polished in manners, capable of holding his ground alike with men of fashion and men of letters.

Here Northcote remained for five years, treated, he tells us, quite as one of the family. Sir Joshua appreciated his earnestness and industry, encouraged his studies, both at home and in the schools of the Academy, and relished his sharp outspoken comments and retorts. In his *Century of Painters* Mr. Redgrave says that Northcote, in his apprenticeship to Reynolds, "had full opportunity of acquiring the

technical knowledge he must have, so greatly needed. He stood beside Reynolds before his easel, he enjoyed free converse with him, he saw his works in all stages; he assisted in their progress, laying in draperies, painting backgrounds and accessories, and forwarding the numerous duplicates and copies required of such a master, and he shared the usual means of advancement and study enjoyed by Reynolds's pupils; at the same time he did not neglect the essential study of the figure at the Royal Academy." Northcote himself, in the *Life of Reynolds* and in his *Conversations*, gives a somewhat different account. He worked with Reynolds, no doubt, and derived benefit from the association; but he complains that Sir Joshua was a bad master, that he taught him nothing directly, would not allow him to use any but the commonest preparations, and locked up his own colours. "He would not suffer me," Northcote says, "during the whole time I resided in his house, to make use of any other materials than the common preparations of colour, just as we have them from the hands of the colourman; and all varnishes, and every kind of experiment, were strictly prohibited." Likewise, all his own preparations of colour were most carefully concealed from my sight and knowledge, and perpetually locked secure in his drawers, thus never to be seen or known by any one but himself." Sometimes, however, Reynolds gave him a sharp lesson in practice. "It was very provoking," Northcote writes, "after I had been for hours labouring on the drapery of one of his portraits, from a lay figure, to see him, with a few masterly sweeps of his brush, destroy nearly all my work, and turn it into something much finer," and yet, he adds, with a touch of pride, "but for my work it would not have been what it was." Copying pictures, though unquestionably useful to him, Northcote detested. "It is," he says, "like plain work among women; it is what anybody can do, and therefore nothing but a bare living is to be got from it." Occasionally he tried to argue with Reynolds, and got put down. Criticising some directions as to colour, given by a visitor, Sir Joshua replied, "He is a sensible man, but an indifferent colourist. There is not a man on earth who has the least notion of colouring: we all of us have it equally to seek for and find out, as at present it is totally lost to the art." Notwithstanding this rebuff, Northcote ventured to advise Reynolds himself:—

"I once humbly endeavoured to persuade Sir Joshua to abandon those fleeting colours, lake and carmine, which it was his practice to use in painting the flesh, and to adopt vermilion in their stead, as infinitely more durable, although perhaps not so exactly true to nature as the former; I remember he looked on his hand, and said, 'I can see no vermilion in flesh.' I replied, 'But did not Sir Godfrey Kneller always use vermilion in his flesh colour?' Sir Joshua answered rather sharply, 'What signifies what a man uses, who could not colour? You may use it if you will.'"

Of Northcote's imitative art, Sir Joshua had a high opinion. North-

cote painted a portrait of one of the maid-servants. The likeness was recognised by a macaw belonging to Sir Joshua; the bird disliked the woman, and flew right at the face of the portrait, and tried to bite it. Failing here, he struck at the hand. The experiment was often repeated for the amusement of visitors. Of his own work at that time, Northcote had not formed a very high estimate. Many years afterwards he told Hazlitt how keenly he noted the failures of other pupils in the Academy,—

“The glaring defects of such works almost disgusted me with the profession. Is this, I said, what the art is made up of? How do I know that my own productions may not appear in the same light to others? Nothing gave me the horrors so much as passing the old battered portraits at the doors of brokers’ shops, with the morning sun shining full upon them. I was generally inclined to prolong my walk, and put off painting for that day; but the sight of a fine picture had a contrary effect, and I went back and set to work with redoubled ardour.”

The direct connection between Reynolds and Northcote ended in 1775, when Northcote was twenty-nine years old. They parted on good terms, Reynolds saying that Northcote had been very useful to him, more so than any other scholar that had ever been with him, and adding, “I hope we shall assist each other as long as we live.” Northcote now went back to Plymouth for a time, and painted portraits until he had made enough money to fulfil his purpose—that of going to Italy to study the great masters—to steal from them, as he afterwards described the process. He spent three years in Italy, not knowing a word of the language, or indeed of any language but his own. This proved no hindrance. He said to Hazlitt, speaking of this journey, “there may be sin in Rome, as in all great capitals, but in Parma, and the remoter towns, they seem all one family. Their kindness to strangers is great. I travelled from Lyons to Genoa, and from Genoa to Rome, without speaking a word of the language, and in the power of a single person, without meeting with the smallest indignity; everywhere, both in inns and on the road, every attention was paid to my feelings, and pains taken to make me comfortable.” In the *Conversations* Hazlitt sums up Northcote’s impressions of this period,—

“He spoke of his journey to Italy, of the beauty of the climate, of the manners of the people, of the imposing effect of the Roman Catholic religion, of its favourableness to the fine arts, of the churches full of pictures, of the manner in which he passed his time, studying and looking into all the rooms in the Vatican. He had no fault to find with Italy, and no wish to leave it. Gracious and sweet was all he saw in her. As he talked (this was when he was an old man of eighty) he looked as if he saw the different objects pass before him, and his eye glistened with familiar recollections. He said, ‘Raffaello did not scorn to look out of himself, or to be beholden to others; he took whole figures from Masaccio to enrich his designs, because all he wanted was to advance the art, and to ennoble human nature.’ ‘Everything at Rome,’ he said, ‘is like a picture, is calculated for show. I remember walking through one of the by-streets near the Vatican, where I met some procession in which

the Pope was ; and all at once I saw a number of the most beautiful Arabian horses curvetting and throwing out their long tails like a vision, or part of a romance. All our pageants are Bartholomew Fair exhibitions compared with what you see at Rome. And then, to see the Pope give the benediction at St. Peter's, raising himself up, and spreading out his hands in the form of a cross, with an energy and dignity as if he was giving a blessing to the whole world ! ”

Raffaello, Titian, and Michael Angelo—the last-named especially—were the great objects of attraction to him. He told Reynolds, on his return, “ For once that I went to look at Raffaello, I went twice to look at Michael.” He made good use of those studies. You must use the great masters, not imitate them : that was his conclusion. It is easy, he says, to imitate one of the old masters, but repetitions are useless.

“ If you want to last, you must invent something. To do otherwise is only pouring liquor from one vessel into another ; that becomes staler every time. We are tired of the antique ; the world wants something new, and will have it ; no matter whether it be better or worse, if there is but an infusion of new life and spirit, it will go down to posterity. There is Michael Angelo, how utterly different from the antique, and in some things how superior ! There is his statue of Cosmo de Medici leaning on his hand, in the chapel of San Lorenzo, at Florence. I declare it has that look of reality in it, that it almost terrifies one to be near it. Is it not the same with Titian, Correggio, and Raffaello ? These painters did not imitate one another, but were as unlike as possible, and yet were all excellent. Originality is neither caprice nor affectation. It is an excellence that is always to be found in Nature, but has never had a place in Art before.”

Northcote, as this passage shows, was a sound critic. He could also describe a fine picture so as to bring it bodily before us. Speaking of Titian, he said to Hazlitt :—

“ There is that fine one which you have heard me speak of—Paul the Third, and his two natural sons, or nephews, as they are called. My God ! what a look it has. The old man is sitting in his chair, and looking up to one of the sons, with his hands grasping the arm-chair with his long spider fingers, and seems to say, as plain as words can speak, ‘ You wretch, what do you want now ? ’ while the young fellow is advancing with a humble, hypocritical air. It is true history, and indeed it turned out so, for the son (or nephew) was afterwards thrown out of the palace windows by the mob, and torn to pieces by them.”

Here is another criticism, on Velasquez,—

“ When a work seems stamped on the canvas by a blow, you are taken by surprise, and your admiration is as instantaneous and electrical as the impulse of genius which has caused it. I have seen a whole-length portrait by Velasquez, that seemed done while the colours were yet wet ; everything was touched in, as it were, by a wish ; there was such a power, that it thrilled through your whole frame, and you felt as if you could take up the brush and do anything.”

A criticism of Titian's portraits is worth recalling. Hazlitt gives it in the *Conversations*.

“ He mentioned his going with Prince Hoare and Day to take leave of some fine portraits by Titian, that hung in a dark corner of a gallery at Naples, and as Day looked at them for the last time, with tears in his eyes, he said, ‘ Ah ! he was a fine old *mouser*. ’ I said I had repeated this expression (which I had

heard him allude to before), somewhere in writing, and was surprised that people did not know what to make of it. Northcote said, 'Why that is exactly what I should have thought. There is the difference between writing and speaking. In writing you address the average quantity of sense or information in the world; in speaking, you pick your audience, or at least know what they are prepared for, or else previously explain what you think necessary. You understand the epithet, because you have seen a great number of Titian's pictures, and know that cat-like, watchful, penetrating look he gives to all his faces, which nothing else expresses, perhaps, so well as the phrase *Day made use of*; but the world in general knows nothing of this; all they know or believe is, that Titian is a great painter, like Raffaele or any other famous person.'

Some painters are as little impressed as the world in general, by the glories of Italian Art. Romney and Edwards were in Italy, and went to the Sistine Chapel. Edwards, Northcote says, "turned on his heel and exclaimed, 'Egad, George, we're *hit*!'"

While Northcote gained inconceivably in Art by his Italian journey, he lost little or nothing in purse. He was very thrifty. Allan Cunningham, in his *Lives of the Painters*, sketches his way of living when abroad.

"I have heard that as necessity and Nature united in making him economical, he lived meanly; associated with none who were likely to lead him into expenses; and as he copied for dealers or travellers a number of the favourite works of the Italian masters, he improved his skill of hand, and rather increased than diminished the sum with which he started from England. Common apartments, common clothes, and common food sufficed for one who was too proud to ask aid from any source, and who had resolved to be independent."

His powers as an artist were recognised, however, by others than dealers. The Italian artists elected him a member of the academies of Florence, Cortona, and Rome. Thus fortified in mind, reputation, and purse, Northcote returned to England, and settled for a time in Devonshire, but removed in 1781 to London, where he took a house in Old Bond Street, with the resolution of combining portraiture and historical painting, making the money earned by the one provide leisure for the other.

He met with discouragement at the beginning of his career. Reynolds told him, half playfully, that there was not much chance. "Ah! my dear sir, you may go back; there is a wondrous Cornishman who is carrying all before him." This was Opie, lately come to London, under the auspices of Dr. Wolcot, best known as Peter Pindar. "What is he like?" asked Northcote. "Like? why like Caravaggio and Velasquez in one." Northcote was a prudent man; he resolved to be on friendly terms with the Cornish wonder, and friends they became, though they were commonly considered rivals in painting. Mrs. Opie's letters bear testimony to Northcote's intimacy with her husband. She quotes, with manifest satisfaction, Northcote's observation, that "while other artists painted to live, Opie lived to paint." Speaking to Hazlitt of Opie, Northcote said, "You did not know

Opie. You would have admired him greatly. I do not speak of him as an artist, but as a man of sense and observation. He paid me the compliment of saying that we should have been the best friends in the world if we had not been rivals. I think he had more of this feeling than I had; perhaps, because I had most vanity." Northcote, however, had the feeling of rivalry pretty strongly. In 1787 Opie and he were elected full members of the Academy. Northcote exhibited his picture—perhaps his best work—*Wat Tyler*, now in the Guildhall. Opie exhibited his chief work, the *Murder of Rizzio*, now also in the Guildhall. While the works were in progress, Northcote went to see Opie's picture. He found it better and more advanced than his own.

"When I returned to my painting-room, I took up my palette and pencils with an inveterate determination to do something that should raise me a name; but my inspiration was only a momentary dream. The ghost of that picture stood between me and my blank canvas. I could see nothing but the murderers of Rizzio. I felt I could have rejoiced if they had seized the painter and murdered him instead. Yes, I could. This dwelt upon my fancy until I laughed at the conceit, for, thought I, then there had been a meddling fiddler and rival painter dispatched at the same expense; and if all the fiddlers and painters were smothered, for aught I know they might well be spared. I dreamed of the picture whilst wide awake, and I dreamed of the picture when fast asleep. How could I help it? There was a passage in the composition wherein the torches—for the scene was represented, as 'eo may remember, by torchlight, and it was the finest trait of effect that ever proceeded from mortal hand. I still dwelt upon it in my mind's eye, in sheer despair. To attempt anything so original, so gloriously fine, I might as well have set about creating another world. I should have died, but for a fortuitous circumstance. I called again to see the hated picture. 'Well, my dear friend,' asked Hazlitt, 'and how did you feel?' 'How did I feel? Gude God! I would not have had Opie know what was passing in my mind for all the world; no, not even to have been the author of the picture. Judge, if 'eo can, what I felt. Why, some wretch, some demon had persuaded him to alter the whole structure of the piece. He had adopted the fatal advice, had destroyed the glory of the Art, and ruined—yes, to my solace—irrecoverably ruined the piece."

Candid, this; but Northcote was candid. When Opie died, in 1807, they feared to tell Northcote, lest he should be too greatly shocked. There need have been no such alarm. "Well, well," he said, "it's a very sad event; but I must confess it takes a great stumbling-block out of my way, for I never could succeed where Opie did."

In this endeavour to sketch the character of Northcote it is needless to dwell at length upon his pictures. It is said that he painted altogether about two thousand works—portraits, historical, and scriptural pieces, subjects from home life, and studies of animals, in the last of which he excelled. The best known of his larger works are the gallery pictures painted for Alderman Boydell. The engravings afford sufficient means to judge of them. They are powerful in parts, but are exaggerated in attitude, and generally too careless in composition, and, like all other works of that period, utterly

defiant of propriety in costume and other accessories. He was thinking of Michael Angelo, and aiming at the grand style; but the grand style proved too large for him—it needed the hand of a great master.

The man himself, however, is a more interesting study than his works. He lived so long and his life covered so great a period—from 1746 to 1831—that he became a sort of institution, a depositary of Art traditions, professional and personal, of the most varied and amusing kind. These he loved to narrate in his own dry, cynical way, for he was an admirable talker. In person he was very short, in dress very careless—his trousers were commonly too long, and his shoes too large,—and in habits penurious to miserliness. By saving, and pinching, and screwing, he accumulated more than £40,000—a large fortune in days when prices were so much lower than they are now. One of Fuseli's sarcasms points this phase in his character. Somebody said that Northcote was going to keep a dog. "Northcote keep a dog!" exclaimed Fuseli; "why, what will he feed him on? He will have to eat his own fleas!" Something had occurred at the Academy to gratify Northcote: "Now," said Fuseli, "he will go home, put more coals on the fire, and almost draw the cork of his only pint of wine." When the exhibition of old masters was begun at the British Institution, a scurrilous publication, called "*The Catalogue Raisonné*," was issued; it was presumed in the interests of the Academy. Haydon writes, as a departure from Northcote's ordinary habits, that he "ordered a *long* candle, and went to bed to read it in ecstasy." Notwithstanding his niggardliness and his biting sarcasm, Northcote's studio was for many years a common resort. "About eleven o'clock" (I quote Mr. Redgrave), "unless he had a sitter, a sort of *levée* commenced. It seldom happened that he remained long alone—one succeeded another, occasionally three or four at a time; and he talked over his work till his dinner-hour, freely discussing any subject which arose, with great sagacity, acuteness, and information, and always maintaining his own opinions."

Haydon in his *Autobiography* mentions Northcote more than once. This is an entry in 1807:—

"On the day the exhibition opened, we all dined with Hoppner, who hated Northcote, who in his turn hated Hoppner. We talked of Art, and after dinner Hoppner said, 'I can fancy a man fond of his art who painted like Reynolds; but how a man can be fond of Art who paints like that fellow Northcote, Heaven only knows.'"

In 1821, in a sketch of the sale of Reynolds's pictures, Haydon again introduces Northcote. The former had induced Mr. (afterwards Sir George) Phillips to buy Reynolds's *Piping Shepherd* for four hundred guineas, then a very large price.

"The purchase," he says, "made a great noise in town, and Phillips was assailed by everybody as he came in. I soon found it was considered by the

artists a sort of honour to be near him, and in the midst of the sale up squeezed Chantrey. I was exceedingly amused. I turned round and found on the other side, Northcote! I began to think something was in the wind. Phillips asked him how he liked the 'Shepherd Boy.' At first he did not recollect it, and then said, 'Ah! indeed! Ah! yes! it was a very poor thing. I remember it.' Poor Mr. Phillips whispered to me, 'You see people have different tastes.' I knew that Northcote's coming up was ominous of something. The attempts of this little fellow to mortify others are quite amusing: he exists upon it. The sparkling delight with which he watches a face when he knows that something is coming that will change its expression, is beyond everything; and as soon as he had said what he thought would make Phillips unhappy for two hours, he slunk away."

Again, in 1825, Haydon has another fling at Northcote, now an old man of eighty, and who might well have been spared:—

"While I was at the Gallery yesterday, poor old Northcote, who has some fine pictures there, was walking about. He nodded to me. I approached. I congratulated him on his pictures. 'Ah! sir,' said he, 'they want varnishing, they say.' 'Well,' said I, 'why don't you varnish them?' He shook his head, meaning he was too feeble. 'Shall I do it?' 'Will 'ee?' said Northcote. 'I shall be so much obliged.' To the astonishment of the Academicians, I mounted the ladder and varnished away. The poor old mummy was in raptures. I felt for the impotence of his age. He told me some capital stories when I came down."

Readers of Northcote's Conversations know well enough that "the poor old mummy" revenged himself amply on Haydon. In Leslie's Recollections we have an equally graphic, but kindlier notice of Northcote:—

"It is the etiquette for a newly elected member to call immediately on all the Academicians, and I did not omit paying my respects to Northcote among the rest, although I knew he was not on good terms with the Academy. I was shown up-stairs into a large front room filled with pictures, many of the larger ones resting against each other, and all of them dim with dust. I had not waited long when a door opened which communicated with his painting room, and the old gentleman appeared, but did not advance beyond it. His diminutive figure was enveloped in a chintz dressing-gown, below which his trousers, which looked as if made for a much larger man, hung in immense folds over a loose pair of shoes, into which his legs seemed to have shrunk down. His head was covered with a blue silk night-cap, and from under that, and his projecting brows, his sharp black eyes peered at me with a whimsical expression of inquiry. There he stood, with his palette and brushes in one hand, and a mahl-stick, twice as long as himself, in the other: his attitude and look saying, for he did not speak—'What do you want?' On telling him that I had been elected an Associate of the Academy, he said, quickly, 'And who's the other?' 'Mr. Clint,' I replied. 'And so Clint's got it at last. You're an architect, I believe?' I set him right, and he continued, 'Well, sir, you owe nothing to me; I never go near them; indeed, I never go out at night anywhere.' I told him I knew that, but thought it right to pay my respects to all the Academicians, and hoped I was not interrupting him. He said 'By no means,' and asked me into his painting room, where he was at work on an equestrian picture of George IV. as large as life, which he must have made up from busts and pictures. 'I was desirous,' he said, 'to paint the King, for there is no picture that is like him, and he is by far the best king of his family we have had. It has been remarked that this country is best governed by a woman, for then the Government is carried on by able men; and George IV. is like a woman, for he minds only his own amusements, and

leaves the affairs of the country to his ministers, instead of meddling himself, as his father did. He is just what a King of England should be—something to look grand, and to hang the robes on.' I asked leave to repeat my visit, which was readily granted, and from that time we were very good friends. He talked better than he painted."

Leslie continues :—

"When I first found myself painting in the exhibition rooms of the Royal Academy, where most of its members were at work, retouching their pictures, I was a good deal puzzled at the very opposite advice I received from authorities equally high. Northcote came in, and it was the only time I ever saw him at the Academy. He had a large picture there, and not hung in the best of places, at which he was much dissatisfied. I told him of my difficulties, and that Wilkie and Lawrence had just given me extraordinary advice. 'Everybody,' he said, 'will advise you to do what he himself would do, but you are to consider and judge for yourself whether you are likely to do it as he would, and if not you may spoil your picture.'

"Northcote then complained to Phillips of the ill-usage he had received from the Academy, and said, 'I have scarcely ever had a picture well hung. I wish I had never belonged to you.' Phillips said, laughing, 'We can turn you out!' Northcote answered, 'The sooner you do so the better; only think of the men you *have* turned out. You turned out Sir Joshua, you turned out Barry, and you turned out West; and I shall be very glad to make a fourth in such company.'

"Mr. Shee, with the adroitness which was natural to him, paid him some compliments. Northcote said, 'Very well, indeed. You are just the man to write a tragedy' (Shee was a very indifferent poet), 'you know how to make a speech.' At another time Northcote complimented Shee in his own peculiar manner, by saying, 'You should have been in Parliament, instead of the Academy.'

Another painter—Thomas Bewicke, the pupil of Haydon—records in his journals a visit to Northcote shortly before his death. Bewicke had been sent to Rome by Sir Thomas Lawrence, to copy some of Michael Angelo's figures in the Sistine Chapel. On his return, he went to show his drawings to Northcote.

"An old servant, almost blind, who had lived with him for half a century, and who had been ordered to leave scores of times, but would not go, opened the door. I sent in my card, and was ushered into the miser's study. I found him alone, dressed in an old dingy green dressing-gown, and cap to match. He received me very graciously, and when I told him I had just returned from Italy, he opened his eyes with amazement. I said I had brought my drawing of Jeremiah to show him. I then unrolled the drawing, and he, holding up his hands, said, 'Ah! wonderful—strange! How grand. Ah! sir, Raffaele and Michael Angelo were grand fellows—we are puny and meagre compared with them, and I fear ever shall be. The style of education in the Arts is so effeminate, if I may so speak, in this country.' Then, in a sententious manner, he added, 'No, sir, they will never be able to comprehend the grandeur of Michael Angelo; you may show Jeremiah upside down for the next century, and no one will see the difference.'

One more quotation—from Hazlitt, the closest friend and intimate of Northcote's closing years :—

"Talking with Northcote is like conversing with the dead. You see a little old man, eighty years of age, pale and fragile, with eyes gleaming like the lights that are hung in tombs. He seems little better than a ghost, is almost

as insubstantial, and hangs wavering and trembling on the very edge of life. You would think that a breath would blow him away; and yet, what fine things he says. 'Yes,' observed some one, 'and what ill-natured things: they are all malicious to the last word.' Lamb called him, 'A little bottle of aquafortis, which, you know, corrodes everything it touches.' 'Except gold,' interrupted Hazlitt; 'he never drops upon Sir Joshua or the great masters.' 'Well,' persisted the other, 'but is he not flowing over with envy, and hatred, and all uncharitableness? I am told that he is as spiteful as a woman. Then his niggardness! Did he ever give anything away?' 'Yes,' retorted Hazlitt, 'his advice; and very unpleasant it is!' At another time the conversation turned upon the living painters, when one of them (Haydon, I think) was praised as being a capital relater of an anecdote. This brought Hazlitt's thoughts to Northcote, of whom he spoke again—'He is the best teller of a story I ever knew. He will bring up an old defunct anecdote, that has not a jot of merit, and make it quite delightful by dishing it up in his own words: they are quite a *sauce piquante*.' 'All he says is very well,' said some one, 'when it touches only our neighbour; but what if he speaks of one's self?' 'You must take your chance of that,' replied Hazlitt; 'but, provided you are not a rival, and will let him alone, he will not harm you; jostle him, and he stings like a nettle.'"

This last remark is illustrated by a story told by Mr. Redgrave in his sketch of Northcote. He hated Sir Thomas Lawrence, probably because the portrait painters of the Reynolds school had gone down before him.

"An artist, then young," says Mr. Redgrave, "who afterwards became a member of the Royal Academy, relates that one day calling upon Northcote, he found him mounted on a pile of boxes, working away with the zeal of a boy at one of his equestrian portraits of George the Fourth, and that his first inquiry of the visitor was whether he had been at the exhibition, and what he thought of the year's collection. To this interrogatory the young artist replied that he thought Lawrence had in the exhibition one of the most perfect pictures in the world. 'A perfect picture, do you say, and from the hands of Lawrence! A perfect picture! Why, you talk like a fool! A perfect picture! Why, I've been to Rome, and seen Raffaele, and I never saw a perfect picture by him; and to talk of Lawrence doing a perfect picture, good Lord! what nonsense! Lawrence doing anything perfect—why, there never was any perfect picture; at least I never saw one.'"

Occasionally, his sharp retorts were turned to legitimate uses. Once when a pedantic coxcomb was crying up Raffaele to the skies, he could not help saying, "If there was nothing in Raffaele but what *you* can see in him, we should not now have been talking of him." Sometimes Northcote professed to be troubled, or really was troubled, by the sharpness of his tongue. Hazlitt says he blamed himself often for uttering what he thought harsh things; and on mentioning this to his friend Kemble, and saying that it sometimes kept him from sleep after he had been out in company, Kemble replied, "Oh, you need not trouble yourself much about them, others never think of them afterwards!" Northcote returned to this point seriously in one of his talks with Hazlitt, and spoke of it with much shrewdness and knowledge of human nature.

"It will never do," he said, "to take things literally that are uttered in a moment of irritation. You do not express your own opinion, but one has opposite as possible to that of the person who has provoked you. You get as

far from a person you have taken a pique against as you can, just as you turn off the pavement to get out of the way of a chimney-sweeper; but it is not to be supposed that you prefer walking in the mud, for all that. I have often been ashamed myself of speeches I have made in that way, which have been repented to me as good things, when all I meant was that I would say anything rather than agree to the nonsense and affectation I heard. You then set yourself against what you think a wrong bias in another, and are not like a wall but a buttress—as far from the right line as your antagonist, and the more absurd he is, the more so do you become.”

Though he had no great literary capacity, and literally no school training, Northcote was desirous of making a reputation as an author. His reading was extensive, but his faculty of composition was limited. He knew no language but English, and this imperfectly. Throughout life he spoke with a broad Devonshire accent, and spelled many words, amongst them the commonest, much as he pronounced them. For Greek literature, even in translation, he had no relish.

“There are some things,” he said to Hazlitt, “with respect to which I am in the same state that a blind man is as to colours. Homer is one of these. I am utterly in the dark about it. I can make nothing of his heroes or his gods. Jack the Giant-killer is the first book I ever read, and I cannot describe the pleasure it gives me, even now.” This was when he was eighty. “I cannot look into it without my eyes filling with tears. I do not know what it is (whether good or bad), but it is to me, from early impressions, the most heroic of performances. I remember once not having money to buy it, and I transcribed it all out with my own hand. This is what I was going to say about Homer. I cannot help thinking that one cause of the high admiration in which it is held, is its being the first book that is put into the hands of young people at school; it is the first spell which opens to them the enchantments of the unreal world. Had I been bred a scholar, I dare say Homer would have been my Jack the Giant-killer.”

The narrow culture thus indicated scarcely fitted the painter for the business of authorship; but, with his customary perseverance, he contrived to write a good deal, and to do it fairly well. He began by contributing essays on Art, critiques, and poems, to Mr. Prince Hoare’s *Journal*, the *Artist*, in 1807. “Mr. Prince Hoare (he says) taxed me the hardest in what I wrote for the *Artist*. He pointed out where I was wrong, and sent it back for me to correct.” His *Life of Reynolds*—still, to a great extent, the best memoir of Sir Joshua—was published in 1813, when Northcote was sixty-seven. Many years afterwards he published a series of his *Fables*, in prose and verse, illustrated by spirited engravings of animals; and a second series was issued after his death. At eighty, he published his *Life of Titian*—none but an artist, he said, could write the life of an artist. It is, however, a feeble and tedious performance, although Hazlitt assisted in the composition, as he did also in that of the *Fables*. This has been denied; but we have Hazlitt’s own testimony to the fact.

A close intimacy had been struck up between Hazlitt and Northcote, and had lasted for several years. Hazlitt conceived the idea

of writing down and publishing their conversations. Northcote assented. "You may, if you think it worth while; but I do assure you that you overrate them. You have not lived long enough in society to be a judge. What is new to you, you think will seem so to others." The Conversations were printed, under the title of "*Boswell Redivivus*," in the *New Monthly Magazine*, then under Campbell's editorship. Their personalities, their freshness, and the racy character of Northcote's sayings, attracted much notice, and provoked sharp controversy. This led to a quarrel between Northcote and Hazlitt. The Mudge family, who had befriended Northcote in youth, were somewhat coarsely assailed in the conversations. Mr. Rosdew, of Plymouth, the nephew of Mr. Zachary Mudge, expostulated with Northcote. The painter "broke out into the most violent expressions of rage and passion. He called Hazlitt a Papist, a wretch, a viper, whom he would stab if he could get at him." Then he wrote to Campbell—

"I find there are frequently papers in your publication, entitled, very modestly, '*Boswell Redivivus*,' insinuating that the hero of this trivial stuff is to be compared to the immortal Dr. Johnson. This person seems pretty clearly to be made out to be myself. Good God! do you not feel this to be dreadful? But this is not the worst of the matter. I have often, in my vain moments, said that I should be pleased to receive morning visits from the Devil, because I might be amused by his knowledge of the world, and diverted by his wit, and should be sufficiently on my guard to avoid his snares. This impious desire has indeed been granted to me, and '*Boswell Redivivus*' is the consequence."

Now that personal controversies are silenced by time, we may estimate The Conversations of Northcote at their true value. As republished in a volume—in the life-time of the painter—they are softened down from the original draught; but spice enough is left to make them most attractive and amusing reading. Northcote was unquestionably proud of them. "Don't," he would say to his visitors with a chuckle, "go and print what I have said;" and, as to the Conversations themselves, he excused himself by saying that "he did not print them," while Hazlitt excused himself by saying that "he did not speak them." This depreciation, however, is mere affectation; both speaker and writer were secretly delighted with their work: and not without cause, for there are few books of the same class which are more original, fuller of shrewd observation, or expressed with greater force and freedom. The reputation of Northcote may, indeed, rest more securely upon this volume than upon his more pretentious efforts in literature, or than even upon his pictures; for, as Hazlitt presents him, he was far brighter and more picturesque than he was upon canvas. To the collected and revised editions of the Conversations, Hazlitt prefixes a motto from Armstrong—

"The precepts here of a divine old man
I could recite."

With a liberal interpretation, this is not too much to say. The charm of the book consists in its frankness and its discursive character. Stimulated by his acute interrogator, Northcote discourses with unreserve on whatever topic may happen to come uppermost—the old masters; Sir Joshua; the brilliant group which met at Reynolds's house; contemporary men, women, and manners; politics, literature, religion, morals—all take their turn, and are all discussed with vigorous freedom, and illustrated with witty observations, or appropriate anecdote. All the while the talker himself is present to the life—his tastes, fancies, prejudices, preferences.

Cynicism was Northcote's habit of mind. He knew it, and tried to excuse the propensity. "I am sometimes thought cold and cynical myself; but I hope it is not for any overweening opinion of myself. I remember once going with Wilkie to Angerstein's, and because I stood looking and said nothing, he seemed dissatisfied, and said, 'I suppose you are too much occupied with admiring, to give me your opinion?' I answered hastily, 'No, indeed! I was saying to myself, "And this is all that the Art can do."' But this was not, I am sure, an expression of triumph, but of mortification, at the defects which I could not help observing even in the most accomplished works." The Ireland forgeries were mentioned. "Caleb Whitefoord," said Northcote, "who ought to have known better, asked me if I did not think Sheridan a judge, and that he believed in the authenticity of the Ireland papers. I said, 'Do you bring him as a fair witness? He wants to fill his theatre, and would write a play himself and swear it was Shakespeare's. He knows better than to cry stale fish.'" Some printsellers failed. Northcote "did not wonder at it; it was a just punishment of their presumption and ignorance." Hazlitt told him that he had seen "the hair of Lucrezia Borgia, of Milton, Bonaparte, and Dr. Johnson, all folded up in the same paper. It had belonged to Lord Byron." Northcote replied, "One could not be sure of that; it was easy to get a lock of hair, and call it by any name one pleased." Of authors and painters he said, "the most wretched scribbler looks down upon the greatest painter as a mere mechanic; but who would compare Lord Byron with Titian?" Speaking of Byron, and the dispute about burying him in Poets' Corner, he said, "Byron would have resisted it violently if he could have known of it. If they had laid him there, he would have got up again. No, I'll tell you where they should have laid him: if they had buried him with the kings in Henry VII.'s chapel, he would have had no objection to that." Of royalty he had something to say.

"You violent politicians," he said to Hazlitt, "make more rout about royalty than it is worth: it is only the highest place, and somebody must fill it, no matter who; neither do the persons themselves think so much of it as you

imagine: they are glad to get into privacy as much as they can. Nor is it a sinecure. The late king, I have been told, used often to have to sign his name to papers, and do nothing else for three hours together, till his fingers fairly ached, and then he would take a walk in the garden, and come, back to repeat the same drudgery for three hours more. So, when they told Louis XV. that if he went on with his extravagance, he would bring about a revolution and be sent over to England with a pension, he merely asked, 'Do you think the pension would be a pretty good one?'

On religion he was cynical also.

"I said to Godwin, when he had been trying to unsettle the opinions of a young artist whom I knew, 'Why should you wish to turn him out of one house, till you have provided another for him? Besides, what do you know of the matter more than he does? His nonsense is as good as your nonsense, when both are equally in the dark.' As to the follies of the Catholics, I do not think the Protestants can pretend to be quite free from them. So when a chaplain of Lord Bath's was teasing a Popish clergyman, to know how he could make up his mind to admit that absurdity of transubstantiation, the other made answer, 'Why, I'll tell you: when I was young, I was taught to swallow Adam's apple; and since that, I have found no difficulty with anything else.'"

The Academy did not please him in his later years: they put his pictures into bad places, and gave preference to other painters of portrait and history. The recommendation-paper for students contained a blank for a statement of the candidate's moral character.

" 'This zeal for morality,' said Northcote, 'begins with inviting me to tell a lie. I know whether he can draw or not, because he brings me specimens of his drawings; but what am I to know of the moral character of a person I have never seen before? Or what business have the Academy to inquire into it? I suppose they are not afraid he will steal the Farnese Hercules. I told one of them, with as grave a face as I could, that as to his moral character he must go to his godfathers and godmothers for that. He answered very simply that they were a great way off, and that he had nobody to appeal to but his apothecary. This would not have happened in Sir Joshua's time,' he went on, 'nor even in Fuseli's; but the present men are dressed in a little brief authority, and they wish to make the most of it, without perceiving the limits.'"

On another occasion he said—

"When the Academy first began, one would suppose that the members were so many angels sent from Heaven to fill the different situations, and that was the reason why it began. Now, the difficulty is to find anybody fit for them; and the deficiency is supplied by interest, intrigue, and cabal. Not that I dislike the individuals, neither. As Swift says, I like Jack, Tom, and Harry, very well by themselves; but all together they are not to be endured. We see the effect of people acting in concert in animals (for men are only a more vicious sort of animals). A single dog will let you kick and cuff him as you please, and will submit to any treatment; but if you meet a pack of hounds, they will set upon you and tear you to pieces with the greatest impudence. The Academy very soon degenerated. It is the same in all human institutions. The thing is, there has been found no way yet to keep the devil out."

Space fails to quote his opinions of artists and others whom he had known—Reynolds, Johnson, Burke, Goldsmith, Garrick; and later, Wordsworth, Scott, Fuseli, Lawrence, Canova, Godwin, and others—of all of whom he spoke with the most engaging freedom

and candour. His character has disclosed itself throughout the narrative; it was cynical in a high degree, but it was marked also by the better qualities of self-reliance, perseverance, and sturdy independence. Two anecdotes bring out these qualities in prominent relief. When Master Betty, the Young Roscius, was playing to crowded houses, Northcote painted him. William the Fourth, then Duke of Clarence, took the young prodigy to the painter's house, and stood watching the progress of the picture.

"The loose gown in which Northcote painted was principally composed of shreds and patches, and might, perchance, be half a century old; his white hair was sparingly bestowed on each side, and his cranium was entirely bald. The royal visitor, standing behind him while he painted, first gently lifted, or rather twitched, the collar of the gown, which Northcote resented by suddenly turning, and expressing his displeasure by a frown; on which his Royal Highness, touching the professor's grey locks, said, 'You don't devote much time to the toilette, I perceive.' Northcote instantly replied, 'Sir, I never allow any one to take personal liberties with me; you are the first who ever presumed to do so, and I beg your Royal Highness to remember that I am in my own house.' The artist then resumed his painting; the prince stood silent for a minute or so, then opened the door, and went away. The royal carriage, however, had not arrived, and rain was falling; the prince returned, borrowed an umbrella, and departed. 'Dear Mr. Northcote,' said one of the ladies present, 'I fear you have offended his Royal Highness.' 'Madam,' said the painter, 'I am the offended party.' The next day, about noon, Mr. Northcote was alone, when a gentle tap was heard, the studio door opened, and in walked the prince. 'Mr. Northcote,' he said, 'I am come to return your sister's umbrella; I brought it myself that I might have an opportunity of saying that yesterday I thoughtlessly took an unbecoming liberty with you, which you properly resented. I really am angry with myself, and hope you will forgive me, and think no more about it.' 'And what did you say?' inquired a friend to whom the painter told the story. 'Say! Good God! what could I say? I only bowed; he might see what I felt. I could, at that moment, have sacrificed my life for him—such a prince is worthy to be a king.' The prince afterwards, in his sailor-like way, said of Northcote, 'He's a damned honest, independent, little old fellow.'"

The next and last anecdote—highly characteristic of the man—carries us back to the studio of Reynolds, when Northcote was his pupil. The Prince of Wales met Northcote, and was pleased with him. "What do you know of his Royal Highness?" asked Sir Joshua. "Nothing," answered Northcote. "Nothing, sir! why, he says he knows you very well." "Pooh!" said Northcote, "that is only his *brag*!"

J. THACKRAY BUNCE.

INDIA AND LANCASTHIRE.

THE entire consumption of cotton by the factories of the world, so far as can be ascertained from reliable sources, was, in 1875, 7,154,000 bales, reducing the bales of various weights to a common standard of 400lbs. each. Of this quantity—

Great Britain consumed	3,187,000 bales, or 44·6 per cent.
Continental Europe consumed	2,362,000 „ „ 33·0 „ „
United States consumed	1,441,000 „ „ 20·1 „ „
Bombay (excluding the rest of India) consumed	164,000 „ „ 2·3 „ „

It is unsatisfactory to have to notice that the proportion of the whole consumption which has fallen to our share, has been gradually declining since 1861, when it was 49·4 per cent., and that although the consumption of Great Britain is greater now than then by only 370,000 bales, that of the Continent of Europe is greater by 568,000 bales, of the United States by 353,000 bales, and of Bombay by 164,000 bales, showing a total increase in these quarters of 1,085,000 bales, or nearly three times that of Great Britain; whilst appearances indicate that the same relative development of the cotton trades of England and the rest of the world is likely to be apparent in the future.¹

The average amount of our entire Export trade, during the last six years, was £232,800,000, to which the average annual contribution of cotton goods and yarns was £74,624,000, or one-third of the whole. It is important to my object that I should point out that during the same period our exports of cotton goods and yarns to India averaged £14,759,695, one-fifth of the total export of our cotton productions.

It may, however, make the survey of the subject more complete, if I also show to what countries we distribute this trade in cottons, and if any reader should find the figures tedious or embarrassing he can readily pass them over as not being of essential importance to what follows. For this purpose I shall deal only with the single year 1875, and it will be found that the proportional features of the trade of that year correspond very nearly with those of the six years. Our exports of all articles amounted to £223,500,000, of cotton goods and yarns to £71,735,000, which was made up as follows:—

(1) Ellison and Co.'s Review of the Cotton Trade for 1875.

EXPORTS OF COTTON GOODS AND YARNS TO THE FOLLOWING COUNTRIES IN 1875.

India and Ceylon	£17,326,566	
Continent of Europe	14,306,828	
China, Hong Kong, and Japan	8,943,834	
Mexico, South America, and West Indies	7,856,016	
Turkey and Egypt	6,133,311	
British Colonies	3,943,217	
United States	1,900,032	
Other countries	6,043,291	
		£66,453,095
Miscellaneous items consisting of lace, hosiery, thread, and other manufactures to all countries		5,281,974
		£71,735,069

The half million people and £120,000,000 of capital directly employed in the cotton trade, and all the multitudinous industries dependent upon it, not the least important of which in a national sense is the shipping trade, depend for their prosperity, in a larger degree than is perhaps generally understood, upon the *foreign* demand for the produce of our spindles and looms. The cotton goods and yarns produced in the United Kingdom in the last ten years have averaged 965,019,800 lbs., and the quantity retained for home consumption 154,400,000 lbs., or only 16 per cent. of the whole.

Large as our cotton industry is, it is a trade of comparatively recent growth, and it is well known that not three generations ago India not only supplied herself with cotton manufactures, but exported them to other countries. It is due to the inventions of Watt, Arkwright, Hargreaves, Crompton, and Cartwright, during the latter third of the last century; to our possession and use of coal and iron; to the obstruction to all organized industrial progress on the Continent of Europe, due to the continued state of war which prevailed there whilst we were giving solid foundations to our manufacturing industry, that we have been indebted, to a great extent, for the vast progress of our various manufactures, and more particularly for that of cotton. It is also due to these circumstances that we have, for so long a period, exported cotton goods to Continental nations as well adapted by nature as ourselves for the trade, and that we have even supplanted the native Hindoo manufacturer in clothing the millions of India to the extent of one-half of their requirements in cotton goods. This advantage could not in the nature of things be permanent. Coal and iron have been found and brought into use on the Continent of Europe and in America; the commerce and manufactures of these countries have grown and are still growing rapidly; and India, no longer relying upon the spindle and distaff, nor upon the hand loom, has adopted our system of factory organization as her means of competition with us, firstly, for the command of her own markets, and doubtless, eventually, for the supply of others, especially those of the far East.

The first Indian cotton-mill was built in 1863, and the *Bombay Government Gazette* of the 4th November, 1875, gives the names of thirty-nine mills actually at work at that date in the Bombay Presidency and other districts, but excluding some in other parts of India; whilst the *Times of India* of March 27th, 1876, gives the number at work in the Bombay Presidency as having increased from the beginning to the end of 1875 from twenty-two to forty. The numbers given in the *Bombay Government Gazette* are, for 1870-1, eleven; 1871-2, fourteen; 1872-3, fifteen; 1873-4, twenty-five; and 1874-5—that is, up to August—thirty-nine. These figures displaying the rapid growth of this industry, I will only produce one other fact to illustrate it. According to the *Times of India* of 17th July, 1874, there were 22,085,000 rupees invested at that time in cotton-mills in Bombay and the neighbourhood, and the *Bombay Government Gazette* of the 4th November, 1875, gives the particulars of factories at work with a capital of over 38,000,000 rupees, thus showing the astounding increase of considerably over fifty per cent. in a single year. It is difficult to ascertain the exact number of spindles at work, but it is within the mark to state it at 1,000,000, and the increase of the year at more than 400,000 spindles. If this rate of increase continues in India—that is, if she adds to her spinning power 400,000 spindles a year—she will have increased her total number of spindles by the entire quantity engaged in England in producing for the Indian markets, which is between 6,000,000 and 7,000,000, in sixteen years. But if she were to go on building factories at the rate of fifty per cent. upon her actual investment at the end of each year, she would accomplish the same end in five years.

There is still, and is likely to be, every inducement to embark capital continuously in these undertakings, and, as I will endeavour to show further on, the retention or removal of the duty will have a powerful influence in fixing the rate, and, in a lesser degree, the extent of its investment. No doubt there will arise from time to time combinations of causes which will temporarily check the progress of this Indian industry, for no great trade can spring up all at once, competing with rivals who have prior possession of markets, and requiring the conquest of first one field of demand and then another, without meeting with occasional difficulty and passing disaster. But on the whole the future of the cotton-mills of India seems extremely hopeful.

It may reasonably be said that these are simply interesting facts; that the return of a trade to its old channels is not unnatural; that it is an occasion of pride to England that she has so far acquitted herself of a contracted obligation to her great dependency as to secure for her the peace which fosters trade, attracts capital, and promotes material development; and that,

although this feeling may be subject to modification, and cannot be unaccompanied with regret that injury is necessarily inflicted upon an important British trade, yet that the British manufacturer has no ground of complaint because the superior natural resources of India are now restoring to that country a trade which temporary causes for a while gave to England. If this were the actual state of the case, I should have nothing to say against it; neither, so far as it is so, have I the least complaint to make.

The demand of Lancashire is limited to asking that the manufacturers of England and of India shall be allowed to compete freely with each other, neither being aided by protective duties. On the side of India there is cheap and abundant labour, cotton indigenous to the soil and close to the factory, with the markets close at hand; and on that of England cheaper machinery and coal, more abundant capital, and a higher intelligence. If the Hindoo, as the result of those gifts with which nature aids him, can take from us the supply of the markets of India, and should he subsequently, from the same causes, deprive us of our large trade with the East, we must bear the consequences, however seriously not only our own, but national interests may suffer.

We do not ask that any impediment should be put in the way of the full development of the Indian cotton industry, nor that it should be exposed to fiscal obstruction of any kind. We object to her import of such cotton as may be found suited to her manufactures being kept from her by import duties, and are quite content that her manufactures should be free of export duty on leaving India, and should enter England untaxed. We offer no opposition to her receiving the machinery and coal required for the establishment and maintenance of her rival cotton manufacture, exempt by exceptional favour from those taxes which are imposed upon almost every other article of import. But, on the other hand, we think it not unreasonable that we likewise should be placed upon a similar footing of freedom from fiscal obstruction, and that our trade with India should not be discouraged and artificially abstracted from us by the continuance of import duties which have become protective, and are aiding the development of a huge national steam-power cotton manufacture in India. So reasonable does this position seem that I should have thought it would have received general support from those engaged in active journalism and politics. It is therefore the more surprising to find that we have to encounter the opposition of Whig and once free-trade lords, and some of the most important London daily papers and periodicals. A formidable group of Anglo-Indians are also arrayed against us, and they have succeeded in impressing upon the minds of some of our most eminent and able political chiefs their despondent views of the Indian revenue, which they regard as so inelastic, so unpro-

gressive, so utterly unmanageable, as to render it impossible for the Indian treasury to spare the duty.

The contest, however, although on a new stage, is of a very old character, and one with which we have been long familiar. The arguments advanced, the agencies employed, the activity displayed, are neither more nor less than, nor in anywise different from, those hitherto in common use, when a protected interest has been struggling to maintain its advantages. The Indian millowners, aided by those who have become directly and indirectly interested in their success, and by the bulk of the Anglo-Indian press which they influence, are simply fighting the battle of protection to "native industry." So completely is this the case that the *Calcutta Statesman*, in a recent leading article, after complaining of the injudicious mode in which the campaign had so far been conducted, suggested with ludicrous naïveté that the protectionist "aspect" of the case should be henceforth left out of sight, and that the revenue difficulty should be alone put forward. It will be my endeavour, therefore, to meet the protectionist arguments advanced from all these quarters.

1st. It is said that the duty is not protective. Had it not been for the arguments advanced in the speeches of Lord Halifax and the Duke of Argyll, and in those made in the Legislative Council of India, I should not have deemed it necessary to say one word in favour of so self-evident a proposition as that an import duty imposed upon an article which is produced at home is protective.

The introduction in August 1875 of the New Tariff Bill, retaining the import duty on cotton goods, reducing other import duties, and repealing the export duty on Indian cotton manufactures and on other articles, and its defence in the Legislative Council, were intrusted to Mr. Hope. With reference to the import duty on cotton goods he made the following statement:—

"The Tariff committee found that the duty levied in all India on the coarse goods was only about four lakhs of rupees, or five per cent. of the entire duty on cotton goods, which amounted to about eighty lakhs, and that only half of this sum, or one-fortieth of the whole, belonged to Bombay, where alone there was as yet any considerable local manufacture. The case, therefore, stood thus, that because one-twentieth of the cotton goods imported were subject to a local competition, which only seriously affected one-half of that twentieth, the Government were asked for the 'total and immediate repeal' of the nineteen-twentieths of the duty paid by the remaining cotton goods on which local competition had no effect whatever.

"In Bombay, no doubt the mills took, to a certain extent, the place of increased imports, but the competition of Bombay mills, like their profits, had been greatly exaggerated. After deducting what they made for exportation, and allowing for the extent to which they had displaced the hand-loom weaving of the country, the residuum was not sufficient materially to affect the argument as stated above. The committee were therefore of opinion that the case for total abolition, on the grounds on which it was claimed, must inevitably fall to the ground."

If we estimate the value of Mr. Hope's argument, we shall find

that the reason why only one-twentieth of our exports to India consists of coarse goods, is that the Indian mills have displaced the remainder of our coarse trade.* If his conclusion is accepted, his position will be stronger each year, for he will soon be able to say, "The Indian mills make only coarse goods. You send no coarse goods to India, and consequently you cannot say that Indian manufactures compete with yours at all." And as the Indian mills produced about 40,000,000 lbs. in 1874, and our whole sendings of coarse goods to India in that year did not exceed 15,000,000 lbs., whilst since then they have nearly doubled their producing power, and are still increasing it, it is clear that in a few years more Mr. Hope might be able to say, "The Indian mills only make coarse goods, and the shirting or medium class; you send to India none of the former, and your exports of the latter are only one-twentieth of your whole export of cotton goods to India. You therefore suffer practically nothing from the rivalry of the Indian mills, and consequently have made out no case for the repeal of the import duty."

The Indian mills will soon have to make other than the coarse class of goods to find occupation for the capital actually and about to be invested. The Indian millowners are quite alive to this necessity, and they are now engaged in making, to a small extent, the finer yarns necessary to the manufacture of shirtings. Samples of these yarns, and of the goods made from them, have been shown in England, and there can be no doubt that they are well adapted to the requirements of the Indian population.

Mr. Hope's assumption that the manufactures produced by the Indian mills had not displaced those of England, but had been partly exported and partly substituted for the native hand manufacture, is disproved by facts easily ascertained. In 1868 the export of Indian cotton manufactures was £1,434,000, the average export in the next three years ending with 1871 was £1,371,000, and for the three years terminating with 1874, £1,401,000; and, as three-fourths of these amounts were re-exports of British goods, it is clear that the increased produce of the Indian mills has not found its outlet in this direction. It is difficult to deal with the allegation that it has displaced the *native hand manufactures* in a direct manner, because it is impossible to ascertain satisfactorily the variations in their extent, but sufficiently accurate conclusions may be arrived at inferentially. The trade of India has extended immensely of late years, having averaged £35,868,465 during the five years terminating with 1854, and £98,346,116 in the quinquennial period ending with 1874, our cotton trade with India having partaken of the general development of Indian commerce, and yet there has been a great falling off in the Indian imports of the class of goods made in the native mills.

It can be shown that, whilst concurrently with the extension

of the factory system in Bombay there had been up to the end of 1874 a reduction in the import of the class of goods made in that Presidency by 60 per cent., there had been an increase, corresponding with the general expansion of Indian trade, in our export thither of the class of goods not made in India, of 270 per cent. Moreover, since the end of 1874, there has been a still further diminution in our exports of coarse goods to Bombay.¹

Hence I may fairly maintain that facts have demonstrated that the production of the Indian mills has taken the place of British, not of native hand manufactures.

I shall now endeavour to show that, although no doubt the duty has materially aided the infant Indian factory industry in its establishment, such are the elements of advantage on the side of the Indian manufacturer, that he can retain the coarse trade without the aid of the duty, and that therefore the proposal which finds favour in some quarters of removing the duty on coarse goods only is indefensible. I shall illustrate my meaning by showing to what extent the advantages on the side of India preponderate over those favouring England, in a mill of 60,000 spindles and 1,000 looms. Such a mill would cost in England about £100,000, and it may be assumed, for the sake of argument, that its cost in India would be £200,000, although it would not be nearly so much. If engaged in the coarse trade, such a mill would consume in the year cotton to the value of about £100,000, and produce goods to that of £200,000. The Indian mill would consume 6,000 tons of coal at 35s. per ton, and the English 5,000 tons at 8s. per ton.

The Indian mill would therefore be weighted with heavier charges for interest and depreciation upon the extra capital of £100,000, and the extra cost of fuel, whilst the English one would be exposed to transit charges upon the conveyance of cotton from India to England, and of the goods from England to India, to the extent of at least 15 per cent. Against the Indian mill, therefore, there would be interest and depreciation, together $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on £100,000, £12,500, and extra cost of coal, £8,500, making £21,000, whilst against the English mill there would be transit charges on £300,000 at 15 per cent., £45,000, and thus the English mill would be at a disadvantage of £24,000, without taking into consideration either the duty, which would amount to £10,000, or the low rate of wages prevailing in India.

As regards the coarse trade, therefore, it would be little better than a farce to remove the duty exceptionally. This trade is virtually gone from England. But the case is different with

(1) I may here explain that as at the earlier period long-cloths, which are coarse goods, were entered in the official returns as shirtings, and as in the later, long-cloths are separately entered, the relative growth in the class of goods not hitherto made in the Indian factories has been greater than the above figures have shown.

reference to the next great branch of our Indian export trade in cotton goods. The "medium," or shirting class of goods, constitutes two-thirds of this trade, and amounts to about £10,000,000 annually.

What then would be the relative position of our Indian and English mill when engaged in this branch? The Indian mill's disadvantages would, as before, amount to £21,000. But, on the other hand, as the cotton consumed would not exceed in value £50,000 nor the goods produced £120,000, the cost in transit charges to the English mill would be reduced to £25,000, diminishing her disadvantage from £24,000, which it would be when making coarse goods, to £4,000. This is no doubt sufficiently serious, but when it is supplemented by the 5 per cent. duty on the turnover of £120,000, or an additional £6,000, there can be no doubt that the two combined are formidable enough eventually to hand over this trade to India.

It is true that, following Mr. Hope's lead, the Bombay Mill-owners' Association has argued that India cannot compete with England for the supply of the Indian markets with any but the coarse goods, for I find in the *Times of India*, an address from that Association to Lord Lytton in which the following passage occurs:—

"Of all this import trade, about £900,000 consisted of coarse descriptions corresponding to the goods turned out by the Indian mills; the remaining £18,500,000 consisted almost entirely of finer qualities which are sent to India by Manchester, and which the Indian manufacturers are unable to produce. It will readily occur to your lordship that the finer qualities of goods, which are consumed by the wealthier classes, are by no means the article of 'first necessity' which the Manchester manufacturers would wish you to believe."

The statement that the Indian manufacturers cannot produce the finer qualities of goods is capable of easy refutation. I have already observed that I have seen yarns and goods of the medium class, made out of Indian cotton in India, of excellent quality. The experience of Lancashire during the time of the American war has proved that at least two-thirds of the goods consumed by the people of India can be made out of Indian cotton, millions of pieces having been so manufactured at that period. It is also a fact, that in India, shirtings, as also a large number of Dhooties requiring finer yarns, are now to a small extent being manufactured. The Tariff Revision Committee of India reported that the Indian mills could make mule twist up to 32's and water twist up to 20's, as also long-cloths, T-cloths, drills, domestics, jeans, and sheetings; but 32's twist is the warp required for the whole of the medium classes of goods, our exports of which to India amount to £10,000,000 sterling annually. We have therefore the authority of the Revision Committee for the statement that the greatest difficulty in the way of this branch of manufacture has already been overcome by the millowners of India, it being a well-known fact that the weft can more readily be

spun from Indian cotton than the warp. Nothing can be more incorrect than the statement of the Bombay Millowners' Association, that the goods composing the £18,500,000 sterling, alluded to in the above extract, are consumed by the wealthier classes; for it is within the knowledge of every English merchant trading with India, that but a very small portion of these goods is consumed by the wealthier classes, the greater consumption being by the masses.

I desire to ask why, if the Indian manufacturers "are unable to produce" the finer goods, they are so intent upon retaining the duty? Are their efforts devoted solely to a disinterested desire to protect the revenues of India; or are they not labouring under an impression that they are defending an impost which is in some way or other advantageous to themselves? They have chosen to speak of the efforts made in England to secure the repeal of this duty as "selfish and unreasonable." I would wish to ask whether the position taken by the English manufacturer, which is that India and England should be permitted to compete with each other, free of every impost and every possible obstruction to their *natural* progress; or that taken by the Indian manufacturer, that *he* should be aided to keep the English manufacturer out of the Indian markets by the assistance of protective duties—is the most "selfish and unreasonable?"

Indian journals have mostly argued the subject from the same point of view; but the *Times of India*, one of the hottest advocates of the continuance of the duty, has adopted an entirely different line of argument in its leading article of March 27th. It says—

"It is very obvious that a duty of 5 per cent. on goods and 3½ per cent. on yarns can but very little affect the case. The real protection to the Indian mills lies elsewhere. Let us examine the matter. The charges and disbursements on the cost of transmission of cotton from India to England, on an average, amount to 1½d. per lb. Those on 30's twist from England to India, 2½d. per lb., or 3½d. per lb. The saving to Indian mills established in the cotton districts is still greater. A skilled manufacturer, who has recently visited Bombay for the express purpose of investigating the working of Indian mills, states that a modern mill, running the latest and most improved machinery, honestly and skilfully managed, ought to pay from 40 to 50 per cent. per annum profit, and at all times a minimum profit of 30 per cent. per annum may be fairly expected on mills in India, arising simply from the avoidance of charges incidental to the transit of cotton from India to England, amounting to 20 per cent. on the price of the raw cotton in Bombay, and return charges to India on yarns and goods, which charges amount to 20 per cent."

Farther on in the article it is stated that "the number of spinning and weaving factories in the Presidency increased during 1875, from twenty-two to forty, and there are now 886,098 spindles and 8,537 looms;" and then, "the Indian cotton-growing and manufacturing industry must be developed surely and rapidly. The abolition of the cotton duties could not retard that development; if there be any magic in free trade doctrines it might even accelerate it."

And thus we see Mr. Hope maintaining that the duty has only an inappreciable protective operation, because England has a monopoly of the supply of the Indian markets in all but coarse goods; the *Times of India*, supporting the position that it has no protective operation, because the advantages of India are so great that the duty adds but infinitesimally to their incidence; and others insisting that it ought to be retained, because the Indian manufacturer requires its aid. The true position, however, is that England having virtually lost the coarse trade, and being about to be involved in a heavy struggle for the balance, it depends upon the course pursued by the Indian authorities whether the contest becomes a fair one, or whether, by mere weight of fiscal pressure, the English millowner and workmen are sacrificed to their Indian rivals.

So strongly is this my conviction, that if the duty is to be removed from a class of goods, I am quite content that the Indian manufacturers engaged in the coarse trade should continue to enjoy the benefit of the duty, which under the circumstances will be entirely without effect; whilst I should ask on behalf of English manufacturers, that the duty upon the medium and finer trades, for which the competition will be real and active, should be repealed. I am by no means certain that, even if the duty be at once removed, England will not have to retire before the natural advantages and resources possessed by India for the supply of her own markets; but it is infinitely important that such a change, if brought about, should be so gradual as to allow of our drifting into our altered circumstances by slow degrees. Neither can it be considered a matter of indifference, that our hard-headed and industrious northern artisans should be able justly to impute to their Government misfortune and deprivation of employment as the result of the maintenance of a duty, which they may attribute to a disposition to foster the trade of India, and transfer occupation from the well-paid British workman to the low-waged Hindoo. That their minds are well prepared for this complaint is clear from remarks that are not uncommon among them, such as the following: "I cannot see why you capitalists should feel so strongly on this question. You can invest your capital in Indian mills, and employ the Hindoo at from 3d. to 6d. a day; but, on the other hand, the question is a vital one to us, for we cannot go to India and work at such wages."

That the duty is regarded and valued by Indian officials as protective is certain. *The Moral and Material Progress of India* for 1872-3, page 109, has the following. "A great quantity of cotton is worked up in India, and the duty on imported piece goods fosters and encourages the home manufacture." The 1875 Tariff Revision Committee recommended the imposition of an import duty

of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on machinery, on the ground that there appeared "no reason for continuing to it the indulgence originally given as an encouragement and help to the nascent manufacturing industry of India;" but the Government rejected the proposal because it was "of opinion that it was as important to encourage manufacturing industry now, as at the time these articles received the favour they enjoy." Sir William Muir said, "one chief merit of the present measures is, that unfettered export will promote domestic manufacture, not only in this case but in that of cotton goods, and we may assuredly hope that India has a new rôle before her by the growth of a flourishing export trade in her own manufactures."

2nd. As regards the assertion "that the duty is insignificant in its incidence on account of the smallness of its amount," I have frequently been asked whether so small a duty as 5 per cent. can have any influence whatever upon the competition for the supply of the Indian markets, and I can well understand that to many it must appear a very unimportant thing. It depends, however, very much upon the nature of a trade whether a 5 per cent. duty is oppressive or not. In small trades where the amount turned over is trifling and the *rate of profit* extremely large, where the income is produced by large profits on a small turnover, the effect of a 5 per cent. duty might not be so serious; but in highly organized trades employing a large capital, where the profits are made by a small per centage upon a large turnover, the case is widely different, and the effect of such a duty may be fatal to a trade.

Take, for example, the Indian and English mills I have before used for the purposes of illustration in the course of this article. Let us presume that the cost of production, and all charges necessary to lay the English goods down in the Bombay market, and the cost of production in the Bombay mill were the same—and this presumption is necessary if we desire to estimate the pressure of the duty *per se*—then we have the Indian mill-owner with a preferential sum secured to him by the effect of the duty of £6,000 a year. Let us then suppose that each mill is worked for thirty years, which we may call the average business life of a man. What then becomes of their relative position? Why the Indian mill has been aided by the duty to the extent of £180,000, besides accumulated interest. Suppose then the English mill to have made nothing, or to have lost £100,000, the Indian millowner is still, through the instrumentality of the duty, a wealthy man.

The above comparison rests upon the assumption that the two mills contain the same number of spindles and looms. It is open to the objection that the Indian mill would involve the investment of more capital than the English, and that the calculation should be made for mills costing the same money, rather than containing the

same quantity of machinery. I have assumed in a previous part of this article, in order rather to under than overstate an argument on my own side, that a mill costs twice as much in India as in England; and if that were so, the Indian millowner would only have half the number of spindles and looms possessed by his English rival, and the duty would only, capital for capital, give him an advantage of £90,000, with interest and compound interest, in his thirty years' competition. I am, however, satisfied that the cost of a mill and machinery in India ought not to exceed by more than fifty per cent. that of one in England, if the arrangements are properly managed throughout, and thus the duty would operate in favour of the Indian competitor to the extent of £120,000, and interest, or two-thirds, instead of one-half, the amount stated in the original comparison.

I have been told also, that such is the enterprise, intelligence, and skill of the Lancashire manufacturer, that should he lose the Indian branch of the cotton trade, which supplies one-fifth of the total export of cotton goods, he would soon develop other outlets for his products.

The facts of the case are against this argument. The Annual Statement of the Trade of the United Kingdom shows that our exports of cottons to all parts of the world, excluding India, were, in 1870, £58,111,793, and that they had dwindled down in 1875 to £55,668,933. It is true that this reduction in value was in a great measure due to a fall in the price of the raw material, but there was also a falling off in quantities, whilst it is usual for the quantities to increase as the price diminishes.

It must not be forgotten, as bearing upon this point, that our best machine makers are everywhere engaged in supplying mills on the continent, in America, and India, with machinery, and that every market has now to be contended for more keenly than ever; that therefore this is not the time when, as Lord Salisbury has said, her Majesty's Government can allow a policy "which Parliament, after mature deliberation, has sanctioned, to be set aside without special cause in any part of the empire under their direct control."

Lord Northbrook, followed by the Bombay Millowners' Association, has argued that because our exports of cottons to India were greater in 1875 than in the previous year, we had nothing to apprehend from the rivalry of Indian mills, and that, combined with the growth of the Indian manufactures, we might also expect an increase in our export trade to India. The fact of an increased export of cotton goods to India in 1875, certainly proves that the consumption of cotton goods in India has enlarged, but this circumstance has no bearing whatever upon the question at issue, which is, whether India or England, weighted by the duty, is best able to supply the markets of India with cotton goods; and the presumption is that India, whose mills have made very large profits in the last two or

three years, will be better able to meet her requirements than the English millowners, whose export trade to India, as is well known, has been conducted at a loss during the same period. I have a balance-sheet of an Indian mill which shows a profit for the year ending the 30th June, 1874, of £27,000, and for the year ending June, 1875, of £24,000—that Indian mill not being *one-third* the size of my own.

3rd. That “the question should be regarded from an exclusively Indian and not in any sense from an Imperial, point of view,” seems an untenable position when the great imperial interests involved and our political relations with India are considered. Holland derives a revenue from Java, Spain from Cuba, when Cuba is at peace: Indeed, with most nations colonies have been principally valued as sources of wealth. As a paramount power we are probably the first nation to set the example of considering that it is among the obligations due to a great dependency, that attention should be given to the development of her resources, the promotion of her moral and material progress, the elevation of her people, with singleness of purpose, and without the subordination of her trading and commercial interests to the promotion of the corresponding elements in the prosperity of the ruling state. It is for the credit of England that she so regards her duty to India. But it would be carrying disinterestedness to a most extravagant length if, when Indian questions arose intermixed with features bearing upon English interests, and capable of solution so as to promote the latter without injury to the former, it should be deemed a point of honour to ignore the imperial point of view, and to act for India not only as if she were an entirely independent power, but as if no such nation as England were in existence.

These duties are levied on an article of general consumption in India, and are, as we have been told by Lord Halifax, paid by the great mass of the people. Their effect is not only to raise the price of all imported goods, but also of those produced by the factories of India, with, however, this difference, that the increase of price *on the imported goods* goes into the Indian treasury, and that on the *home manufactured product* into the pockets of the Indian mill-owner. The consumer, therefore, has not only, through the agency of this duty, to contribute to the Indian revenue, but also to add to the profits, and thus stimulate the growth, of Indian cotton factories: This cannot be an advantage to India if free trade doctrines are not delusions.

Ought we to forget that in estimating the sources of our strength for the maintenance of our Indian empire, the sentiment of the mass of the British people is not to be disregarded? They may be asked to shed their blood and lavish the wealth of the

kingdom in defence of this magnificent possession. Is it then politic to weaken the material links which bind England and India? Our exports to India have averaged £21,331,420 during the last six years, and to this amount the average contribution of cotton goods and yarns has been £14,759,695, or over two-thirds. If this branch of our Indian trade should be lost, the whole value of English products consumed in India would be reduced to a comparatively insignificant amount. Might not those who make parliaments and dictate the composition of governments ask the question, Is India worth the sacrifice? Is it not all the more likely that such a question should rise to the lips of artisans, should British industries be transferred, by the instrumentality of protective duties, from England to India? Is it impossible that the motives for the persistent maintenance of a false system, by which the cheap labour of the Hindoo supplanted the dearer labour of the British workman, should be suspected? We all know that when the honour of England is in question, class jealousies are suppressed, and that if the great trial should come, all classes would combine to vindicate our right and superiority; but is it wise—by a wilful disregard of economic principles—universally accepted in England, to give occasion for hesitation and not unreasonable discontent?

It has been stated as a duty of the Secretary of State for India, that he should "study everything from an Indian point of view, and make himself the spokesman and defender of India before his countrymen at home." It seems, however, to be forgotten that the Secretary of State for India is a member of the Imperial cabinet, responsible like every one of its members to parliament and the country for all its measures, not only as they may concern this or that colony or dependency, but as they affect imperial concerns, not forgetting England as a somewhat important factor in the Empire; and that should he be disposed to leave England entirely out of his survey he may be brought "face to face with the fact that the supreme power is" in parliament. It is idle to attempt to transform the Secretary of State into a purely Indian minister. It is the province of the Viceroy and the Legislative Council to think exclusively of India, and of the Secretary of State for India to temper their proposals with just that degree of modification which may guard imperial interests from being subordinated unduly to Indian sectional interests or prejudices, which are not unlikely at times to weigh with too heavy a preponderance upon the thought and judgment of those engrossed with the details of the government of that vast empire, with all its complicated organization and infinite variety of wants, systems, and stages of development.

4th. If "it is true that Indian prejudices as well as Indian true interests should guide our policy as governors of India," then pro-

bably we should hesitate to punish infanticide, that being regarded as consistent with sound economic principles in some important districts of India, whilst even Suttee has the support of wide-spread native prejudice; and, probably the most cherished Indian prejudice of all is, that it would be for the advantage of India—that, at least, it would increase her dignity and give her the blessings of independence—if we were to retire from the country.

I am inclined to think that it is our duty to India, so long as we rule her through the agency of appointees of the crown, to apply to the Government of India those economic principles which we have proved by experience to be best calculated to promote the well-being of nations; and if it is answered that the prejudices of the people interpose an impassable barrier in the way of such action, I reply that there are many important evidences to the contrary, and that the ablest Indian statesmen are not so oppressed by the sense of the impossibility of doing in India what is best for her interests.

5th. Although it is admitted by the Government and many of our opponents that this impost ought to go, we are told that “the continuance of the duty is indispensable to the equilibrium of Indian finance.”

It ought first to be agreed what is meant by the equilibrium of Indian finance. Sir George Campbell would pay for the bulk of the “extraordinary public works” out of revenue, and have a normal surplus of from two to five millions sterling to meet possible contingencies. No objection can be raised to such an aspiration. To spend less than your income, to improve your estate, and to lay by an annual surplus is creditable and desirable alike to individuals and states. With the latter it is the most difficult, because public revenues are provided from private purses, and taxpayers are unwilling to pay more than is indispensable to meet current expenditure. Hence it can hardly be expected that the elevated financial system which Sir George Campbell prefers can be introduced into India. The wealthier nations of Europe are compelled to be less ambitious; and those responsible for the government of India are content with a moderate surplus over ordinary expenditure. I am afraid, therefore, that we must be satisfied if India can pay her way as regards all ordinary expenditure, and if she borrows money when she invests on a large scale.

Lord Northbrook, speaking at the meeting of the Legislative Council of India in August last, said, “It will be seen that our surplus in four years has amounted to £7,000,000, or more than three times the sum which the Home Government desired. This satisfactory result, moreover, has been accompanied by a considerable remission of taxation. In the year 1873 the income tax, which, during the two preceding years had produced a net sum of £1,362,570, was allowed

to lapso. The Southern Customs line, which drew its long and obstructive length of 800 miles across Central India, has been abolished at a considerable sacrifice to the salt revenue; and yet in each of the last two years we have realised a very substantial surplus. The sound condition of our finances, in my opinion, mainly results, on the one hand, from the gradual increase of the revenue in consequence of the increased wealth and prosperity of the country, and on the other, from the exercise of strict economy in every department of the State."

Sir William Muir, the Finance Minister of India, said, "Then the other main sources of our revenue—land, excise, salt, customs—are all in a sound state, and show a tendency to rise, and that in a far more marked and rapid way than any increase in the charges of administration." And when introducing the budget for 1876-7 he also used these words: "As most of the improvement is the outcome of a progressive advance in the leading branches of the revenue, it may be safely concluded that the sources of imperial income are in a sound condition, and, indeed, that they never gave better promise of prosperity."

It is true that all this bright aspect of the condition of the Indian revenue, as regards its elastic and progressive character, the satisfactory progress and prosperity of all the various sources of revenue, is to a certain extent clouded by the loss arising from the fall in the value of silver. The gloomy views and predictions expressed about the revenue have, however, been advanced irrespective of this element of difficulty, and would have been urged equally if it had not arisen. I shall examine and criticise some of these views, and I think I shall be able to expose their fallacy.

First, then, as to the progressive character of the revenue. The entire revenue of India, in 1840, was £20,124,038, and in 1875, £50,570,177, showing a most remarkable increase in thirty-five years. It is true that the boundaries of India have been increased by conquests since 1840, and that part of the development of her revenue is due to that cause; but so far as I have been able to ascertain, the entire revenue derived from these conquests has not exceeded £6,000,000 to £7,000,000 sterling per year. The conquered provinces are Scind, the Punjaub, Sattara, Behar, British Burmah, Bera, and Oudh. In 1858 the revenue was £31,706,776, since which time there has been no addition to territory. Thus, as a result of the progress of the wealth and commerce of India, the great advance of from £31,706,776 to over £50,000,000 has been contributed by the people of India. Then it is often urged that the opium revenue is not trustworthy. In 1840 it was only £784,266. It has since advanced by gradual stages until in 1875 it had reached £8,556,629, and it surely must have undergone the various trials and checks to which it is possible for it to be exposed during that

lengthened period. The salt revenue was in 1840 £2,696,745, and in 1875 £6,227,301. Attention is here called to the great increase that has taken place in this branch of Indian revenue, because statesmen of Indian celebrity, and Englishmen who have adopted their views, are continually declaiming against the salt revenues of India. Whenever a demand is made that the protective duties on cotton fabrics shall be repealed, they put forward the greater necessity for the repeal of the salt duties. It is perfectly clear, however, that those responsible for the government of India and its finances have no earnest intention of giving up this important source of income. So far from showing a disposition to give up these £6,000,000 sterling a year, they have from time to time increased the pressure of the tax, and are constantly engaged in altering and probably improving the nature of its incidence, thereby indicating that they regard it as a permanent source of revenue, and probably as a legitimate means of reaching the great mass of the Indian population. I am not prepared to deny that I should be glad to see these taxes reduced, although I cannot think that the millions of India should be freed from all share of the cost of the government of their own country. But, on the other hand, I must urge that the duty on salt is not open to the objection that it is protective, and tends to diminish the resources of the people.

Then when we are told that no new sources of Indian revenue can be introduced with advantage, the great development of the stamp duty seems to lead to a contrary conclusion, for the stamp duty realised only £427,687 in 1840; and although this is a kind of tax unknown in the native history of India, the revenue derived from it in 1875 had reached £2,758,042. It can therefore hardly be said that our statesmen are limited to the ancient modes of levying taxes in India.

Sir George Campbell, in an able and interesting article which appeared in this Review in the month of April, entered very fully into his views on Indian finance. He stated that there was a deficiency on the year 1874-5 of £4,526,592. He arrives at this conclusion by a process of reasoning to which I demur, apparently in common with Lord Northbrook, and those most concerned in the actual working of Indian finance. It does not seem consistent with true principles of finance to debit the expenditure on reproductive works to ordinary revenue. Those who advocate this policy are undoubtedly largely influenced by the apprehension that much of this outlay will be expended on works which are not reproductive, and will not pay either directly or indirectly fair interest upon the capital invested. Of course it is indispensable that the financiers of India should prevent outlay of this unsatisfactory description. It is, however, extravagant to propose that India, whose finances are so assailed as to their want of strength and power, should invest such

sums as four millions annually in what may be called new estate, and debit this expenditure to revenue.

In the charges for the year 1875-6, famine relief stood for £656,000, and it may fairly be doubted whether the cost of such a famine as that which has just occurred in Bengal and Behar should be debited to the ordinary revenue of the current years. It was stated by several leading Indians, in the debate on the cost of this famine, that it was of a character and intensity which only exhibits itself once in a century. India seems to be afflicted by famines like this and scarcities, the scarcities being about decennial in their appearance. It therefore would have been fair and statesmanlike to have distributed the cost of the famine relief over a series of years, and not to have made the revenue of India appear so much less satisfactory than it really was by debiting nearly seven millions sterling to the ordinary revenue of three years. As Lord Northbrook has pointed out, when the Irish famine occurred, only two millions were debited to the revenue of the year, and the remainder was borrowed.

I think, therefore, that it will be admitted by most, that the cost of reproductive works, such as railways and irrigation works, are not a fair charge against "ordinary revenue," and many will allow that the famine charge might have been distributed over a number of years. All I think will agree, that if actually paid out of the revenue of the years when it occurred, it should not be treated as a permanent, continuous source of expenditure, when dealing with the question of the adequacy or inadequacy of the Indian revenue to pay its way.

Moreover, it happens that Sir George Campbell had before him only the "regular estimate" for the year 1874-5, and that since his paper was written we have been put in possession of the "closed accounts" for that year. The actual revenue has exceeded the estimated by £500,177, whilst the expenditure is less than was estimated by £167,813; and thus, excluding the cost of public works extraordinary, being capital invested, Sir George Campbell's deficit of £4,526,592 is converted into a surplus of £319,130. But famine charges to the extent of £2,237,860 were debited to the ordinary revenue of the year, and but for this the surplus would have been £2,556,990, which cannot be considered unsatisfactory. I give below a statement which shows the actual results of the Indian revenue and expenditure for the years 1870-1 to 1874-5, and the regular estimated results for 1875-6, which are likely to prove correct, not treating the expenditure on public works extraordinary as a charge against revenue, but stating its amount, and showing what the surplus in each year *would have been* but for the famine charges, and *what it actually was*, these being debited:—

Year.	Surplus excluding Famine Charges.	Surplus including Famine Charges.	Deficit including Famine Charges.	Cost of Famine Relief.	Cost of Public Works extraordinary.
1870-1	£ 1,482,990	£ 1,442,990	£ ..	£ ..	£ 1,167,810
1871-2	3,124,177	3,124,177	1,628,474
1872-3	1,765,672	1,765,672	2,184,569
1873-4	2,057,005		1,807,668	3,864,673	3,553,307
1874-5	2,556,990	319,130	..	2,237,860	4,249,566
Regular Estimate. ¹					
1875-6	1,903,000	1,247,600	..	656,000	4,143,000
	12,889,834	7,898,969	1,807,668	6,758,533	16,926,726

Budget estimate²

1876-7	144,000	144,000	3,759,000
--------	---------	---------	------	------	-----------

The statement shows the satisfactory surplus of £12,889,834 on the six years, if the famine charge of £6,758,533 is excluded from the account, and £6,091,302, if the whole of this heavy amount is debited to the last three years.

The Budget Estimate for 1876-7 shows only the nominal surplus of £144,000, estimating the loss by exchange at £2,332,000, or near a million more than in the previous year. Let us hope that the growth of the Indian revenue will again, as last year, exceed the estimate, and that a large surplus will accrue. Be that as it may, the loss by the fall in silver is a serious difficulty, and its worst feature is that it is impossible to calculate how far it may go.

It has, however, an equally injurious effect upon our Indian export trade, and, as the amount to be received from India in payment for cotton goods and yarns is, like that which has to be remitted on account of the Indian Government, about £15,000,000, the cotton trade and the Indian Government suffer to the same extent; and the loss by exchange operates as an additional protection, of even heavier weight than the duty, in favour of Indian manufactures.

The loss of the English manufacturer is, of course, no help to the Indian Treasury, but it adds urgency to our protest against the exposure of our Indian trade in cotton textiles to extinction by the continuance of this duty. The Government should remember that if the duty contributes to the loss of this trade, it is at the same time helping to terminate its own existence.

In India the telegraphs, barracks, and other important public works have been constructed entirely out of ordinary revenue, whereas the custom in this country has been always to borrow capital for such purposes; and it cannot be doubted that Indian resources must be more considerable than is supposed by some, for

(1) The loss by exchange on London was £1,425,000.

(2) The estimated loss by exchange is £2,332,000.

they are able to bear a strain which our Chancellor of the Exchequer would never think of imposing upon our own revenue.

The public mind has been misled as to the true position of the Indian exchequer by the statement that there has been no development of the revenue since 1870. The revenue in that year was £50,901,081; in 1875-6 it is estimated at £50,991,060; but those who have put before the public the fact that the figures or actual total of the revenue so nearly correspond in those two years, should not have omitted to state that there was an income tax in 1870 amounting to £1,089,503, which has since been given up; and that in 1872 there was a transference from the Indian imperial revenue to provincial services, to an amount nearly equal to £800,000 a year, whilst, according to Lord Northbrook, the southern customs line has been abolished at a considerable sacrifice of the salt revenue. We have, therefore, a clear loss of about two millions sterling from these causes, and it is most gratifying to find that the other sources of Indian revenue have recuperated sufficiently to make up for the concession of these important items; the state of Indian revenue, therefore, cannot be regarded as calculated to excite the despondency in which some indulge, such considerable progress having been made in so short a time.

It is probably not generally known that the ordinary Indian revenue has had to provide £50,000,000 sterling for expenditure on ordinary public works during the last ten years, and that it was stated in the House of Commons, during the last debate on the Indian budget, by more than one eminent Indian authority, that the public works staff was on a scale of excessive extravagance. It was said that it cost from $1\frac{1}{4}$ millions to $1\frac{1}{2}$ millions sterling annually, and the opinion was freely expressed that it ought not to exceed half this sum.

I have endeavoured to show that the Indian import duties on cotton goods are protective, and that they are defended on account of their protective character; that the competition between England and India for the supply of the Indian markets is not, as those combined to defend the tax assert, limited to the coarse trade, but that it is a more serious and vital struggle for the great bulk of our cotton trade with India; that it would be unjust, impolitic, and most unstatesmanlike to expose the capitalists and artisans of England to the obstruction of such an incubus, whatever the position of Indian revenue; and lastly, that the Indian revenue itself is not in such a position of difficulty as to render it impossible to make the concession which sound policy dictates; far otherwise, that it is in a fairly elastic and healthy state, and only requires sound discrimination in the mode of handling it, to render the Indian exchequer one of the most prosperous.

R. RAYNSFORD JACKSON.

THE LAWS ON COMPULSORY EDUCATION.

THE purpose of this article is to collect and compare the several enactments relating to compulsory education, and to show how far, when thus looked at together, they appear a satisfactory body of law. It would be beside this purpose to enter directly upon the abstract questions connected with compulsion. The question, for example, which is at the root of the matter—the question how far interference by governments with the freedom of parents is desirable or defensible—may here be entirely passed over. The mere existence of the enactments to be examined proves that, with us, this is not an open question. It has, in fact, been practically settled since the year 1802. Ever since, there has been growing up among us that great fabric of State interference which it is our purpose here to describe; and, from the day when that fabric was founded, the question was settled for ever. For the growth of the fabric to completion was merely a matter of time. When once the State had insisted upon the children in one trade being educated, it was impossible that to them should remain confined a benefit equally needed by the children in all other trades; and when once children had been forced to school from working in useful employments, to let the idle and unproductive children go free was an anomaly that could not endure.

Probably few people are aware how great a mass of law upon our subject has now grown up—of confused and complicated law, embodied in a multiplicity of Acts, which represent various distinct branches of legislation, and which certainly show no agreement and perhaps show some actual conflict.

The following is a list of the enactments which it is here proposed to examine:—

1. The Factory and Workshop Acts, 1833 to 1874, fourteen in number.
2. The Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1872.
3. The Agricultural Children Act, 1873.
4. An enactment regarding out-door relief (Education Act, 1873, section 3).
5. The Elementary Education Acts, 1870 and 1873; and the School Board Bye-laws made under them.

The first remark which this list suggests is that the law seems capable of arrangement under two separate heads—the exclusively educational, providing for direct compulsion; and the incidentally educational, attaching an educational condition to the enjoyment of

some benefit. The Education Acts and Bye-laws seem to fall under the former head, and all the Acts regulating labour under the latter. But this logical arrangement is spoiled by the introduction into the Education Act, 1873, of the provision which stands fourth on the list; for this provision, attaching an educational condition to the receipt of out-door relief, is clearly a measure, not of direct, but of indirect, compulsion. It may further be remarked, with regard to the suggested division, that the Agricultural Children Act stands almost upon the dividing line. It is a measure of indirect compulsion, but it cannot be fairly described as a measure only incidentally educational. The other Labour Acts, above enumerated, may correctly be so described, for they impose several limitations and conditions, beside the educational condition, upon the use of a child's labour; but the Agricultural Act imposes no limitation upon it, except that the child must be at least eight years old, and subjects it to absolutely no condition other than the educational. This Act, then, is as nearly as possible of an exclusively educational character.

One more remark upon the list, before individually examining its contents. It takes no account of (1) criminal children, compulsorily educated in reformatories under the "Reformatory Schools Acts 1866 and 1872;" (2) vagrant, homeless and beggar children, or children charged before the magistrates with certain minor offences, or found in the company of thieves, or pronounced refractory and unmanageable; who are subject to compulsory education in industrial schools under the "Industrial Schools' Acts 1866 and 1872;" (3) pauper children, compulsorily educated in workhouses, district schools, and training ships. These classes of children come under special kinds of compulsion which may be omitted from this general review. They are put under a special treatment—not merely educated but also fed, clothed, and lodged. As to the reformatory children, they are in no way connected with the compulsory systems here to be reviewed, and not at all likely to be affected by any change of the law of compulsion. The industrial schools, on the other hand, are connected with the school board system of compulsion, and may be affected by a change of the law. Not only may these schools be established and maintained by school boards, but they are also very largely recruited by school board agency. This, no doubt, is one reason why industrial schools have greatly multiplied of late, while reformatories have been almost stationary. Indeed, the Inspector, in his Report for 1875, specially called attention to what he considered the "misuse" of industrial schools by their being made into "schools of compulsory education for the ignorant and uncontrollable." Regarding such schools as primarily intended to check crime—as, in his own words, "preventive and correctional institu-

tions—" he objects to the use made of them by school boards in order to supply certain deficiencies which experience has found in the Education Acts. For, under the Education Acts, boards can only proceed against the parent: they cannot deal directly with the child, and take him into their own guardianship. But they find many cases, in which the child either has no "proper guardianship," or has a parent or guardian who represents "that he is unable to control" him, and, in such cases, the boards avail themselves of the Industrial Schools Act to secure for the child an education, which they could not prevail on the guardian to give him, or which he would himself evade by habitual and incorrigible truancy. The use so made of industrial schools by school boards is large and increasing. Thus, during four years the following numbers of children, respectively, were sent by the London School Board to industrial schools, 228, 503, 627, and 608; and the board has now six officers employed in sending fit cases to such schools. But the Industrial Schools Act does not exactly answer the purpose. The shortest term of detention which it contemplates, is a period of eighteen months, and where boards procure the committal of those children, whom Lord Sandon has taught us to call "wastrels," shorter terms would often be preferable. Enforced separations of parents from children should obviously be as short as possible; and the law should avoid offering facilities to parents for escaping responsibility by handing over their children into bondage. Hence the Education Bill now before the House provides for committals to industrial schools for periods so short as one month.

1. The Factory Acts, which stand at the head of our list, have been described as fourteen in number and as extending from 1833 to 1874. This by no means includes all that have been passed, but those which it omits have, with one exception, been repealed. This one, although practically obsolete, deserves attention as first of the series. This is the Act of 1802, passed under the Addington Administration, by the first Sir Robert Peel. Its educational provisions are as follows:—Apprentices in cotton and woollen mills shall, during the first four years of their apprenticeship, be taught "reading, writing, and arithmetic, or either of them," upon every working day, during the hours of work, by a teacher provided and paid by their employer; also, they shall receive religious instruction for an hour every Sunday, and, if members of the Church of England, shall be examined once a year by the parochial clergyman, and, when of fit age, be presented for confirmation; also, they shall be made to attend divine service at least once a month.

These provisions differ from those of the later unrepealed Acts in that (1) the persons who are the objects of them, the "apprentices," are not defined by age or otherwise; (2) the time during which they

are to be under instruction on each working day is not specified; (3) no mention is made of schools as separate institutions—the instruction is to be given within the mill; (4) it is not made the duty of any Government officer to see that the law is observed: it is merely enjoined upon the justices of the peace to make arrangements for ensuring its observance; (5) this alone of the Factory Acts makes provision for religious instruction.

In the thirty years following 1802 six Acts were passed for the further regulation of cotton factories; but these Acts related almost wholly to hours of work and sanitary rules, and, educationally, added nothing to the provisions of 1802. The first of the six, indeed, passed in 1819, made an important step towards our present factory law in its educational bearings, by fixing an age under which children might not be employed. The age so fixed was nine—an age retained in the Act of 1831, which, coming last of the six Acts above referred to, repealed all preceding Factory Acts, except the Act of 1802, but was itself repealed, two years later, by an Act which (although practically superseded so far as regards its educational provisions) is still unrepealed, and is regarded as the foundation of the present factory law. This Act is the Act of 1833, brought in by Lord Ashley (the present Lord Shaftesbury), and taken up and with some modifications passed—one of the firstfruits of the Reform Bill—by Lord Althorp, then leader of the House of Commons. This Act, after reciting in words applicable to the Agricultural Children Act, that the provisions of the Act of 1802 had been evaded “partly in consequence of the want of the appointment of proper visitors or officers whose special duty it was to enforce their execution,” proceeds to provide for the appointment of Inspectors of Factories who are to require the observance of the educational, as well as of the other, regulations of the Act. These educational regulations are as follows:—Children from nine years of age (the earliest age at which employment in factories is by this Act permitted) up to thirteen years of age are to attend during at least two hours a day upon six days of every week at a school chosen by the parents, or, in default of such choice, appointed by the Inspector. In the latter case, the Inspector may order the employer to deduct from the child’s wages a sum not exceeding one-twelfth of them, and to pay the same to the school-teacher. If the Inspector thinks the teacher incompetent, he may stop this payment. If he thinks an additional school requisite, he may “establish or procure the establishment of such school” out of (presumably, but the Act is not clear on this point) the fines imposed upon parents and employers; for both were made liable to fines, the parents up to twenty shillings, the employers up to twenty pounds. This Act applies to nearly all the textile manufactures—cotton, woollen, worsted, hemp, flax, tow, linen, or silk.

The advances made by the above provisions beyond the Act of 1802 were great. First, there was the institution of Inspectors. Second, there was the definition of school-age by the same method as has been used in subsequent Factory Acts; that is to say, by the fixing of a limit of age under which children could not be employed, and of another limit beyond which they ceased to be "children" and became "young persons"—a promotion which emancipated them from school. Third, it was recognised to be the parent's duty, as well as the employer's, to see that the child was educated, and to be the parent's right to select the school; for the Act of 1802, in its directions and penalties, had regard to the employer only, and, as we have observed, nothing was said in it about choice of schools, probably because, in those days, there were in most places no schools to choose between. Fourth, some sort of consideration was to be given to the question whether the teacher could teach or not. The Act of 1802 had laid down, indeed, that he was to be a "discreet and proper person;" but by whom and how his discretion and propriety were to be tested was very insufficiently, if at all, indicated. Fifth, there was some sort of feeble provision for the supply of additional school-accommodation where it was wanted.

The next Factory Act, passed by Sir James Graham under Sir Robert Peel's administration in 1844, is so far in force to this day as to be of the highest importance. Like the preceding Act, it applies to the textile manufactures, and, by the inclusion of hair and jute, completes the list of them. Its educational provisions are as follows:—Children from eight years of age (when their employment, by this Act, was allowed to commence—a year earlier than had been allowed by the Act of 1833) up to thirteen years of age are to be made by their parents to attend school in either of the two following ways:—(1) If the children be employed every day, they must attend school every day, except Saturday, for three continuous hours, or, in winter afternoons, for two hours and a half; (2) if they be employed only upon every second day, they must upon the alternate days, except Saturday, attend school for five hours a day. The employer, if required by the Inspector, must pay school-fees up to the amount of twopence a week for each child, and may, for the purpose of this payment, deduct from the child's wages a part not exceeding one-twelfth. The Inspector may refuse to recognise attendance at a school pronounced by him to be grossly inefficient, but must not do so without naming another school for the children; which other school must be within two miles of the factory. The penalties, for employers, may range between one pound and three; for parents, between five shillings and a pound.

This Act virtually repealed, by entirely superseding, the rules for school-attendance contained in the Act of 1833; and by its new

rules upon this subject, together with its directions limiting the hours of employment, it led to the use of double sets, or "shifts," of children, alternately relieving each other, and thereby invented the "half-timer." A high authority, indeed (Mr. Redgrave), states that the Act of 1833 had "rendered a double set of children necessary," and adds the remark, interesting as explanatory of the legislation of 1844, that it was in consequence of "the great effect thus produced upon the supply of labour that the subsequent Act (1844) permitted the employment of children at eight years of age," instead of nine. But I am supported by the recent Factory Commission in pronouncing the half-timer, as now understood, to be the invention of 1844 rather than of 1833 (Report, vol. i., p. lx.).

The Act of 1844 was followed in 1846, 1850, 1853, 1856, 1861, and 1864 by a series of Acts which did not alter its educational provisions, and of which we need only sum up the results. Ropewalks were specially exempted from it in 1846, only, however, to fall under it again in 1867, so far as they are covered by the general words, below quoted, of the "Factory Acts Extension Act 1867." The Acts of 1850, 1853, and 1856 were entirely without educational purpose or effect. The Act of 1861 brought lace factories under the educational and other provisions of the Act of 1844; and, in 1864, those provisions were extended to the following miscellaneous list of trades: the manufactures of earthenware, lucifer matches, percussion caps, and cartridges, and the employments of paper-staining and fustian-cutting. In 1867, the Act of 1844 gained a still wider comprehensiveness by the Extension Act above referred to; which, after specially subjecting to it all sorts of iron, copper, steel, gutta percha, and india rubber works, the manufactures of paper, glass, and tobacco, and the employments of printing and bookbinding, declared it, in general terms, to apply to "any premises in the same occupation, within the precincts of which fifty or more persons are employed in any manufacturing process."

In this year, 1867, a year memorable in the history of indirect compulsion, there was also passed, by Lord Derby's Government, the "Workshops Regulation Act." This Act was passed in consequence of the Report of the Children's Employment Commission, 1862-67, which had pointed out that the result of "extending the Factory Acts to large establishments, while omitting the smaller, would be to drive away work from large and generally well-conducted establishments into places less healthy and worse regulated" (Factory Commission, 1876, Report, vol. i., p. xciv.). The Act defines a "workshop" as "any place whatever in which any handicraft is carried on by any child, young person, or woman," and defines "handicraft" in the same elaborately comprehensive terms, which are used in the Extension Act just described as a definition

for "manufacturing process." Thus, "workshops" do not differ in kind from establishments to which the Factory Acts are extended. Since, however, establishments subject to the Factory Acts are exempted from the Workshop Act, the application of that Act is limited (with a few exceptions) to establishments which belong to industries not expressly referred to in the Factory Acts, and which, by reason of their employing less than fifty hands, are not brought under the Factory Acts by the general words above quoted, of the "Factory Acts Extension Act, 1867." To all such small establishments, except bakehouses, the Workshop Act applies. Its provisions, so far as they concern us, are as follows. It allows children to be employed at eight years of age, like the Factory Act of 1844. From eight up to thirteen, children are to be made by their parents to attend school at least ten hours a week, unless there is no school within a mile. As under the Factory Act, the employer must pay the school-fees, if required so to do, up to twopence a week, and may deduct one-twelfth of the child's wages for this purpose. If a school is pronounced grossly inefficient by an Inspector of Factories, attendance at it may not be accepted under this Act any more than under the Factory Act, unless there is no other school within a mile. The Inspectors of Factories, however, were not named in the Workshop Act as the authorities to work it. It was to be enforced in different localities by different local authorities, Sewer Commissioners, Vestries, Town Councils, Local Boards, and Improvement Commissioners.

In 1870, the "Extension Act 1867," above mentioned, was itself extended to print works and bleaching and dyeing works; which had been expressly excepted from it by its fifth section. Thus these industries also were brought under the educational provisions of 1844. In 1871 the enforcement of the Workshop Act was taken from the local authorities, above referred to, and was given to the Inspectors of Factories. The local authorities had almost universally failed to enforce the Act—a failure which was not without its significance as a guide for future legislation.

We now come to the last of the series of Factory Acts, taken up by the present Government from its introducer, Mr. Mundella, and passed with some modifications by Mr. Cross in 1874. It made some important educational changes, but its operation is limited to the textile factories as defined in the Act of 1844, and, with the exception of lace works, does not affect any of the industries subsequently brought under that Act. The provisions of 1874, so far as they concern education, are as follows:—They forbid the employment of children under ten, and declare childhood to last till fourteen, thus altering the factory school-age from the period between eight and thirteen to the period between ten and fourteen, and thereby, it will

be observed, making it shorter by a year. Further, a "child" may still become a "young person" under these provisions at thirteen, and thenceforth be free of school, if certified by the Education Department to have attained a certain educational standard: so the school-age under this Act need not necessarily be longer than from ten to thirteen. Children within the meaning of the Act must attend school in either of the two ways specified in the Act of 1844; but with this difference, that the school must be one recognised by the Education Department as efficient. A child may, however, attend a school not so recognised, provided that either (1) the school-district (under the Education Acts), in which such school is situated, has not been declared by the Education Department to be sufficiently provided with school-accommodation, or (2) there is no school recognised by the Department within two miles of the factory.

The former of these two provisos is strangely drawn. As it stands, a factory child, although the factory is in a district amply supplied with recognised schools, may pass by these efficient schools and go to an unrecognised school in an adjoining school-district (and the lax conduct of the inefficient schools is often no small inducement), provided that such adjoining district be insufficiently supplied with school-accommodation. One would have thought the material point to be, not whether the *school* was, but whether the *factory and the child's home* were, in a district sufficiently provided with recognised schools. The two provisos might thus have exhausted between them the reasonable grounds for attendance at an unrecognised school. The first proviso would have said, "A child need not go to a recognised school, if he works in a district which has not got room enough in its recognised schools for all its children:" the second would have added, "he need not attend a recognised school, even though he works in a district with room enough for all its children in its recognised schools, unless one of those schools is within two miles of him."

Again, a question arises, whether this proviso does not nullify the enactment. Our factories are mostly situated in the big, growing boroughs, and it may be doubted whether many of these can ever be pronounced by the Education Department "sufficiently provided with public school-accommodation." Their rapid increase makes such a declaration difficult; and if in the case of any borough such a declaration were made, an unfortunate consequence would appear to ensue. The school board of such borough would seem to be thenceforward debarred from borrowing money. For boards can only borrow with the consent of the Education Department and for the purpose of supplying public school-accommodation. Now the Department can only consent when they are satisfied that the school-accommodation which the board proposes to supply "is required in

order to provide for the educational wants of the district" (Education Act 1873, §10). But if the Department acting under this Factory Act declared a district "sufficiently provided with public school-accommodation," it is difficult to see how they could afterwards be satisfied that any additional school-accommodation, which the board proposed to supply, was "required in order to provide for the educational wants of the district," or how, if not so satisfied, they could consent to a loan. Thus we seem to be in a dilemma with regard to this enactment requiring attendance at a recognised school. The requirement cannot be enforced without the making of a certain declaration most difficult to make in those districts in which it is of most importance that the requirement should be enforced; and if in any of those districts the declaration were made, the consequence, certainly untoward, would seem to ensue, that the school board of that district could not borrow any more money.

This Act of 1874, it will be observed, postpones (1) the commencement of labour from eight to ten, (2) the commencement of full-time labour from thirteen to fourteen, unless the child pass an examination at thirteen. Whether the former alteration is to be an educational gain or not, depends upon what is done for enforcing school-attendance up to ten. If nothing were done, the alteration would be an educational loss: for, generally, the future half-timer puts off school until he enters the mill. The second alteration is reported by the Factory Commission to be no educational gain. At present, this is the only Act which tries to stretch the school age beyond thirteen. And such isolated endeavour must fail: all advance must be along the whole line. Children who cannot pass the examination, and thereby become full-timers at thirteen, will not, says the Report, continue as half-timers. They will simply go to some occupation not subject to this Act, or, possibly, remain unemployed. Having reached thirteen, they are safe from school-boards—safe, indeed, when they get from under this Act, from every existing form of compulsion.

Having now shortly reviewed the Factory and Workshop Acts, we may consider how far they exhibit that complexity and confusion which we stated to be characteristic of our law of compulsory education. Viewed in regard to the whole body of their provisions, these Acts have been universally denounced—by Mr. Cross no less than by Mr. Mundella—as complicated to the very verge of unintelligibility. "A more confused jumble of legislative enactments does not exist in the Statute Book," says Mr. Redgrave, Inspector of Factories, quoting from a high legal authority. Here, however, where we need only view the Acts in regard to their educational provisions, we need only ask, whether any of the complexity thus attributed to the Acts is observable in this particular part of them.

Let us take a few instances and see. A is a boy of nine, employed in a print-works factory: what are the educational provisions applicable to him? First, we look at the latest and lastly-described Factory Act, and we find that print-works are not subject to it; for it only affects industries regulated by the "Factory Acts 1833 to 1856" and the "Lace Factory Act 1861," and, on reference to those Acts, we discover that print-works are not among such industries. Thus driven from the latest of the series, we look back through the Factory Acts in search of something applicable to our boy; and we find that in 1870 print-works were specially provided for by the "Factory and Workshop Act 1870," to which allusion has above been made. This Act, however, contained no educational provisions. It merely repealed certain Acts relating to print-works, which would, if unrepealed, have answered our question; and, in lieu of those Acts so repealed, it placed print-works under the "Factory Acts Extension Act, 1867." But our search does not end with this Act of 1867; for it also, as we have seen, contains no educational provisions. It only brings the industries to which it applies under several earlier Acts, and, on looking back through these, we at length make out that A's education is regulated by the Factory Act 1844, and that he must therefore attend school in either of the two ways there prescribed. B is another boy of nine, resident in a town where the only mills are textile factories subject to the Act of 1874. As children under ten cannot be employed in such factories, he escapes compulsory education under the Labour Acts, though he is not less fit to work and not less in want of education than A. C lives in the same town as B, but, being eleven, can work in the mills. So he must attend school as much as A; but since C's mill is under the Act of 1874 and A's under the Act of 1844, they get different kinds of schooling. C must go to a school recognised by the Education Department; but a school, of which the teacher has not been pronounced grossly incompetent by the Inspector of Factories, is good enough for A, although it may have been declared inefficient by the Inspector of Schools, and although the Inspector of Factories, who lets it pass uncondemned, may have been appointed (if for any special qualification) for his surgical or mechanical knowledge, and without any regard to his capability of determining the worth of a school. Again, C must attend school until he is fourteen; while A can cease from attending at thirteen. D, a fourth boy, works at an industry not specially referred to by the Factory Acts, and in an establishment employing only forty-nine hands. He falls under the Workshop Act. Two days a week is all the schooling the law requires for him. D's brother, E, works next door, at the same trade, but in a bigger establishment, employing fifty-one hands. Such an establishment is, as we have seen, brought by the Extension Act, 1867,

under the Factory Acts; and so E gets half-time schooling daily. The legislature has decreed that the two more hands employed in E's establishment shall give him considerable educational advantages over D; and we can only hope that D's confidence in the wisdom of Parliament remains unabated. F and G are another pair of brothers, both working at a biscuit factory. E works in the part of the Factory where they bake the biscuits. This part is clearly a "Bakehouse" within the meaning of the "Bakehouses Act, 1863," and, as such, is, as we have seen,* excepted from the "Workshop Act, 1867." Now the Bakehouses Act has no educational provisions at all. Hence, F has no schooling at all guaranteed to him. G works in another room of the establishment which contains no ovens, and over which the Inspectors of Factories have therefore been able to push their authority under the Workshop Act. So he gets his two days a week in school. But the ovens in the room with F debar him from all educational privileges; and, indeed, by putting him under an Act which is lax in its provisions and loosely worked—being still confided to "local authorities"—these ovens expose him to various other inconveniences. Delicate children, whose employment for ten hours a day in the lighter processes of biscuit making has been disallowed, are occasionally, says a Sub-inspector of Factories, (see Factory Commission Report, vol. i., p. xviii.) "sent down into the bakehouse where they can be employed apparently for sixteen hours at a stretch. This arrangement, I am informed, is facetiously described as 'putting them into the hot-house to mature.'" Such genial and kindly banter must do much to console the poor victims.

Again, the limits, by which school-age is bounded under the Factory Acts, are more various than the above sketch could point out. We have seen that the "child" of the Act of 1844 is between eight and thirteen; of the Act of 1874, is between ten and fourteen, unless, by attaining a certain educational standard, he can constitute himself a "young person" at thirteen. We may add that, by special provisions affecting certain trades, employment is made to commence even later than ten. Thus, in fustian-cutting, the "child" is from eleven to thirteen; and in metal-grinding childhood is similarly bounded; while in glass-melting (from which girls are excluded) the "child" is a boy between twelve and thirteen. In brick-making, from which also girls are excluded, the "child" is a boy between ten and thirteen. Similarly, the other Labour Acts, which we are about to consider, define childhood in their own various fashions. They say "it is a wise child that knows its own father:" but what shall be said of the wisdom of a father who, in spite of this variety of definition, knows whether his own offspring is a "child," or not?

These are a few of the complexities of these Acts. With regard to their educational efficiency, much evidence has lately been taken by a Commission, whose report, admirably drawn up by their Secretary (Sir George Young), has already been often referred to. The results of the evidence may be thus summed up. The half-time school-attendance under the Factory Acts has done good service, especially the half-day attendance, which is much more useful (and, luckily, much more common) than the alternate-day attendance. The Workshop Act has, on the other hand, been educationally valueless. The school-attendance of ten hours a week prescribed by it would, if enforced, be insufficient for the children, and most detrimental to any well-organised school which consented to admit them. This, of course, assumes that the attendance is made cumulatively as the Act permits—is crowded into two days, in fact—and is not spread out over the week. Such cumulative attendance is bad for the progress both of the children and of the school which admits them. Nor is even this attendance enforced. The inspection of the factories is effective; but the workshops are, both in the serious and slang sense, far too many for the Inspectors. Besides, the Workshop Act is full of flaws. It requires no proof of age, either from registrar or surgeon. In the factories there is cheating enough about age; but in the workshops there is not even the surgeon to look into the child's mouth, in the veterinary-like factory fashion, and guess what the age is from the teeth. Again, the ten-hours attendance is only required in a week during the whole of which the child has been employed in the workshop, so that any break in the employment, however small, altogether releases from the requirement. Fortunately, in some places—in Sheffield for instance—where there is a general desire for education, employers make the workshop children attend half-time, as if they were factory children; but no thanks to the Workshop Act for that. In such places, the two classes of children are taught together, and are not distinguishable from each other, in the Public Elementary Schools. In fact, the Inspectors of Schools know nothing of ten-hours children; for the workshop children who avail themselves of their Act to attend merely during this *minimum* time do not go to inspected schools but to Adventure Schools, or, as Mr. Mundelka prefers to call them, "Evasion Schools."

2. Second to the "Factory and Workshop Acts" upon our list comes the "Coal Mines Regulation Act 1872." The legislation which led up to this Act resembles the Factory legislation in that it began by being generally humanitarian, and has recently become more and more specially educational. The first Act we have to mention was passed in 1842, and, like the Factory Act of 1833, was one of Lord Shaftesbury's services to the cause of humanity. Armed with the

report of a Commission, which had been inquiring about mining, and which, among other horrors justifying Lord Shaftesbury's designation of their report as "that terrible document," stated, that infants of four years old were to be found working in the depths of our collieries, Lord Shaftesbury passed an Act prohibiting all females, and all boys under ten years of age, from being employed underground. In 1850 and 1855 further Acts were passed, attempting to establish an efficient system of mine inspection. In 1860 Sir George Cornwall Lewis passed the first Act containing educational provisions applicable to mines. The existing law, that no boy under ten was to be employed underground, was re-enacted, and a further enactment was added, that no boy under twelve was to be employed underground unless the employer had obtained a certificate "under the hand of a competent schoolmaster" to the effect either that the boy could read and write, or that he had attended school for three hours a day, on two days a week, during the preceding month. These provisions naturally proved to be of no educational use whatsoever. Lord Morley described them to the House of Lords as the "merest farce" in the course of introducing the Act of 1872 with an interesting review of the Acts that had preceded it. In 1872 two Mine Acts were passed by Mr. Bruce (Lord Aberdare): one for Coal Mines, the other for Metalliferous Mines. The latter, which prohibited all females, and all boys under twelve, from working underground, contained no educational provisions. The idea of the Legislature appears to have been, that the boys between twelve and thirteen employed underground, and all children employed "on the bank," would be educationally provided for by the Factory and Workshop Acts, or by the direct compulsion of school boards. The Coal Mines Act, on the other hand, permitted the employment underground of boys between ten and twelve where the coal-seams were thin, and for such boys made some educational provision. They must attend school, if there is one within two miles, during twenty hours every fortnight, and of these twenty hours not more than three may be continuous, not more than five may be in one day, not more than twelve in one week. The employer must, if required to do so, pay the boy's school-fees up to two-pence a week, and may deduct from the boy's wages any sum so paid up to one-twelfth of those wages. The Inspector of Mines may refuse to accept attendance at a school pronounced inefficient by him, but such refusal is subject to an appeal to the Education Department (under the Factory Act 1844 and the Workshop Act, appeals in similar cases lie to the Home Office), and can only take effect when there is another school for the children to attend within two miles.

It will be observed, that these educational provisions are in the main modelled upon the Workshop Act. That Act requires an attendance of ten hours a week; this Act requires an attendance of

twenty hours a fortnight. The reason why the cumulative system of attendance was, with some limitations, adopted in this Act, is said to have been, that the danger arising from very frequent ascents and descents of the mine-shafts might be avoided. Whatever the reason for its adoption, the system has unquestionably failed. So far as education is concerned, the Coal Mines Regulation Act may be asserted to have all the faults of the Workshop Act, besides some of its own. It only professes to provide for the education of children up to twelve years of age, while the Workshop Act provides for them up to thirteen. "The Mines Act," says an Inspector of Factories, "allowing a child to work full time at twelve, makes a coal-mine a refuge for any child who gets punished for failing to attend regularly at school, *i.e.*, a refuge for those children who stand most in need of education. This privilege undoes much of the good wrought by the Factory Acts." All the other Inspectors of Factories bear similar testimony. Again, with regard to children employed "on the bank" at mines, there is a conflict of jurisdiction between the Inspectors of Mines and of Factories, the consequence of which is that the children are not looked after by either. Mr. Oakeley, Inspector of Schools in Durham, who alike from the position of his district and from his own ability is probably the best qualified person in the country to pronounce an opinion upon the subject, declared the Act a failure, educationally, in 1873, and has only been confirmed in this view by his two years of subsequent experience. The Inspectors of Mines have too many other duties to be able to attend to education, even if they knew how; and the Colliery schoolmasters naturally like to work amicably with the Colliery "viewers," by whom they are appointed. The consequence is, that the Act, which at best could do little for education, is systematically violated.

3. Third upon our list comes the "Agricultural Children Act 1873." Its provisions, shortly stated, are as follows:—Children under eight may not be employed in agriculture, except by the parent, on his own land. Children between eight and twelve may not be employed, unless the parent has obtained, and the employer has seen, a certificate, dated not more than a year previous to the employment, certifying the age of the child and that the child, if the age is under ten, has attended school two hundred and fifty times, if the age is over ten, one hundred and fifty times, during the year preceding the date of the certificate. The school attended must be a school recognised by the Education Department or the Local Government Board, unless there is no such school within two miles of the child's home. Children are exempt from the above requirement if certified by the Inspector of Schools to have "reached" (which the Education Department interprets to mean "passed in

all the three elementary subjects" under) Standard IV. In "agricultural gangs," no child is to be employed under ten. There are certain provisoes (not greatly needed) to prevent the Act from working too stringently; the penalties are not to exceed, for employers £5, for other persons (presumably parents) £1, but may be as low as the magistrates please; and there is nobody appointed to work the Act.

It may be observed that this Act was introduced by a leading Conservative, the representative farmer, Mr C. S. Read, and that, in introducing it, he hardly claimed that it was likely to effect much. He called it "an extension of the principles of the Factory Acts, in a mitigated form, to agriculture;" and, in defence of the very mitigated form indeed in which his Bill embodied those principles, he urged that "employment in farming operations, being essentially healthy," did not need much limitation. Indeed, the way he played fast-and-loose with "the principles of the Factory Acts" is worthy of observation. When excusing his Bill for permitting employment at so early an age as eight, he thought "it would not be wise to alter the Factory Acts and the other statutes which start at the age of eight;" but, when excusing it for not having made its educational provisions extend, like the Factory Acts, up to the age of thirteen, he frankly affirmed: "My answer is, that I do not think there is any reason why a child who has reached the age of twelve should not have received ample education . . . In illustration of what I am advancing, I may state that there is a boy upon my farm who is assisting his father in attending to my bullocks. This boy can do sums in vulgar fractions, and I am sure that he could pass a school-examination better than I could, although that, perhaps, may be no great commendation for him, and he is just twelve years old."

This boy who is "attending to bullocks," and certain other children working in "market-gardens and orchards," whom Mr. Read cited as instances of the class who would come under his Act, lead us to point out, that, if the Act worked, it would be necessary to settle what "agricultural work" was. Is gardening agriculture, or is horticulture to be distinguished from agriculture, and, if so, is a market-garden, or an orchard, to be regarded as "ager" or as "hortus?" Is Mr. Read certain that his typical children "gathering apples in orchards" are doing "agricultural work?" And as to that boy "attending to bullocks," surely when so engaged he is pursuing a pastoral vocation, and is no more doing "agricultural work" than when he is engaged upon his vulgar fractions. "Barking" and "acorning"—occupations, which, according to the School Inspectors, employ great numbers of country children—are they to be held "agricultural"?

If the Act worked, on questions so trivial would depend the momentous issue for thousands of children, whether they were to get some education or none. The "Agricultural Children Act" is the only law of compulsory education applicable to nine-tenths of the country, and only those children who are doing "agricultural work" can profit by its provisions.

We say advisedly "*some* education or none;" for, in truth, all they would get under this Act, if it worked, would be little worth. Take an instance:—A certificate issued on the 28th of February, 1876, stating that A.B., a boy certified to be ten years of age, had attended school one hundred and fifty times since the 1st of February, 1875, would be in force for one year from the date of its issue—that is to say, until the 28th of February, 1877, and would therefore enable a farmer to employ A.B. up to that date—say, for instance, during the first two months of 1877. Now, since A.B. could have made his one hundred and fifty attendances in fifteen weeks, he might have got them over by the middle of June, 1875. So he might thus be working for two months of 1877 without any contravention of the Act, although he had not been inside a school during the whole year 1876, or during the last six months of 1875.

But the Act does *not* work. If it was only a failure, no harm, at least, might have been done. But the worst of it is, that, just at first, the people in many districts believed in it, and the schools were suddenly crowded with rough, untaught children, come to qualify themselves for employment under the new law. The effect was bad on the schools, and was worse upon the people; for soon they came to discover that the children who had not gone to school were in no way worse off in respect to employment than those who had gone, and that parents and employers who had tried to keep the law were simply laughed at for their pains. Of course, the sudden influx to the schools quickly abated, and then ceased; and a general feeling against compulsory education, as a poor sort of sham, was very widely created. It is in evidence, that in some parts of the country the people now do not believe there was any such Act. They think it was the "Mrs. Harris" of compulsory legislation, a figment of the parson's brain, paraded before them in order to feed the Church school and thereby (for there is a popular impression that attendance at the Church school in some mysterious way benefits the parson) to do good to himself. It would have been far better for education if this Act had never passed. The Education Bill now proposes to repeal it; and no Act could be repealed with less loss.

4. The fourth law upon our list is the enactment relating to outdoor relief. By the Act known as Donison's Act, Guardians were permitted to pay school-fees for the children of persons receiving outdoor relief, but were not permitted to make the attendance at

school of such children a condition of the relief. The third section of the Elementary Education Act, 1873, repeals Denison's Act, and makes it a condition of continuous out-door relief that for every child between five and thirteen years of age of the person so relieved "education in reading, writing, and arithmetic shall be provided," unless the child (1) falls within certain cases, excused by section 74 of the Education Act 1870 from having to attend school under a school board bye-law, or (2) has reached a certain prescribed educational standard, or (3) is being educated under the Agricultural Children Act.

Of all the enactments of compulsory education this is one of the most curiously fashioned. The main direction says nothing about any particular school, or, indeed, about any school at all. But attached to it are provisoes and exceptions which do not in the least fit in with it, and which seem very clearly to contemplate attendance at a Public Elementary School; that is to say, a school which conforms with all the conditions of the Government annual grants. Not unnaturally the guardians have been puzzled as to where, and how, the prescribed "education in reading, writing, and arithmetic" should "be provided." The Local Government Board cuts the knot for them, instructing them, in some published letters, that it must be provided in a Public Elementary School. The governing words of the section seem thus to have a good deal put into them which is taken from the provisoes and exceptions; though the virtue of these latter is usually held to be merely to limit and modify. And the provisoes are strange things themselves. The words "or refused," thrown apparently at random into one of them, makes it not English and hardly intelligible. The Government Education Bill, which proposes to repeal this enactment, substitutes for it one more clearly expressed.

Further, the law has not worked without friction. The schools to which these out-door pauper children have been sent by the Guardians have very frequently, and not unnaturally, objected to receiving them; and cases have been made public in which the law is alleged to have occasioned much hardship. In fact, so doubtful a gain is the enactment, that some Boards of Guardians have declared in favour of its repeal, and recently we find the Salford School Board passing a resolution to the following effect:—"That the Board desires to express its concurrence in the resolution of the Guardians of the Chorlton Union—namely, that the provisions of the Education Act 1873, § 3, making the education of every child between five and thirteen years of age a condition of out-door relief, is one that in many cases inflicts an amount of hardship altogether disproportionate to any advantages to be obtained by thus indirectly enforcing education." (See *Manchester Examiner* of March 10th.) And indeed this

enactment, most illogically introduced (as we have seen) into the Act in which it finds place, is compulsion in a revolting form. The essence of indirect compulsion is the attaching of an educational condition to the enjoyment of some benefit. In the case of all other enactments of indirect compulsion, the benefit is one of which the community may, without cruelty, deprive him who shirks the condition. It is the use of a child's labour, or earnings. But, in this case, the benefit is bare subsistence. In this enactment, the community says to the parent who cannot support himself and his family, "I am still afraid to make compulsion general; but of you, at least, I am not afraid." You are down. I can compel you, and I will. Educate your child, then, or I will let you starve." This indeed is compulsion—compulsion with a touch of class-legislation. In practice, of course, the relieving officers do not let the recalcitrant parent starve; but, in strict pursuance of this enactment, they should offer him either starvation or the workhouse.

5. Last upon our list come the Education Acts and the bye-laws made under them by school boards. By the last printed return (April, 1876) it appears that, of 14,307 school-districts in England and Wales, 2,264 are now under school boards. As in many cases two or more districts are under one board, the number of boards is less than 2,264—is, in fact, only 1,653. Of these 1,653 only 527 have passed bye-laws enabling them to compel children to go to school; but inasmuch as the boards of nearly all the large boroughs have passed such bye-laws, the total population under bye-laws is not very much smaller than the total population under boards. The figures stand thus:—Total population of England and Wales in 1871, 22,712, 266; total population now under boards, 12,522,537; total population under bye-laws, 10,167,615. Nearly all the earliest-formed boards have passed bye-laws. Thus of twenty-six boards formed in 1870 only one (the borough of Cardigan) would appear not to have passed bye-laws. Of 312 boards formed in 1871 eighty-four have not passed bye-laws; and of these eighty-four, curiously enough, fifty-two are in Wales; while a large proportion of the rest are in Cornwall and other parts of the country where Nonconformists abound. In such parts, it may be inferred, a board was rather for attack upon the Church than for forcing children to school. Of the more recently-formed boards, a steadily-increasing number in proportion to the lateness of their formation have not yet passed bye-laws. Of course, many of these may be preparing bye-laws and may be expected soon to pass them; but it should be remembered that the boards formed recently and now being formed are for the most part formed compulsorily—forced upon the districts in order to supply deficiencies of school-accommodation—and that, among such boards, we can hardly look

for the educational zeal evinced by the earliest-formed boards, which were formed in obedience to the request of the districts. We therefore need not be surprised to find that less than one-third of the boards existing in April last had passed bye-laws.

A further diversity is introduced by the differences between the bye-laws of different boards. On this point, as it would be impossible to attempt an analysis of 527 sets of bye-laws, I will merely quote some remarks from Mr. Owen's excellent "Education Acts Manual :"—

"In one case at least the bye-laws provide for total exemption from compulsory attendance in the cases of children above ten years of age, who have passed the examination in the Third Standard; in others, the Fourth Standard is adopted; in others, the Fifth; and in some the Sixth. The practice as to partial exemption varies very considerably in the different districts. Some bye-laws contain a clause to the effect that any child of not less than ten years of age, upon his showing to the satisfaction of the board that he is beneficially and necessarily at work, shall be exempt from full attendance. . . . In some rural districts the bye-laws contain special clauses as to attendance in harvest-time and other exceptional periods of field-work."

These remarks seem sufficiently to show what widely-different kinds of compulsion the bye-laws of different school boards may prescribe.

Again, of the boards which have passed bye-laws it is notorious that some make no effort to work them. Thus we have variety to the following extent throughout the country :—Some districts with boards, some without boards; some boards with bye-laws, some boards without bye-laws; some boards with one kind of bye-laws, some boards with another kind; some boards vigorously working their bye-laws, some working them languidly, some not working them at all—a very pretty diversity. And yet it may be presumed that children throughout the country need education with considerable uniformity.

To the above inequalities of the school board system of compulsion, several might be added; but there is not space for more than the most cursory mention of a very few of them. The school board districts, as constituted under the Education Acts, are in many cases most inconvenient areas over which to apply compulsion. Numerous instances might be found of towns, compactly inhabited, and each organised under its own Local Board or Improvement Commissioners, which, for the purposes of the Education Act, are split up between several school-districts. Thus, Heywood in Lancashire, a Local Board district with a population of about 22,000, living in a compact town, is split up into five separate school-districts; and Mossley, a Local Board district with about 11,000 inhabitants, into four different school-districts, of which one is in Lancashire, one in Yorkshire, and two are in Cheshire. Utter confusion might be

produced in these towns by the existing law of compulsion. At one side of the street, children might be swept off to school by a vigorous board, while the other side, being in a different district and having no board, might have the whole of its youth continuously playing marbles. And cases not unlike this do actually arise. Outside nearly all the large boroughs there is a fringe of districts without school boards, whither the careless parents migrate in order to defy the school board officer. Many of these districts, or parts of them, are divided from the borough by a mere imaginary line, and form one continuous town with it. Indeed, in the manufacturing parts, the population has a distinct tendency to gather into the thickest masses exactly on the line between school-districts; and the reason is obvious. The school-districts, or civil parishes, in a hilly country such as Lancashire and Yorkshire, are usually bounded by the rivers and streams, and upon the rivers and streams arise the manufacturing towns. If compulsion is to be applied in such towns, clearly it is of the first importance that it should be applied by some authority which is recognised on both sides of the water, and over the whole mass of population.

So far of school boards, separately considered. Let us now glance at them in connection with those other agencies of compulsion which we have previously reviewed.

School boards may certainly supplement the educational provisions of the Labour Acts. Thus, a child who is eventually to be employed under the Factory Act 1874, not being eligible for such employment until he is ten years of age, may, if he lives in a school board district, be compelled by the board to go to school from the time he is five—when he first becomes liable to a bye-law—until he is ten, when he goes to work and comes under the Factory Act. So far there is no doubt. But at this point a question arises, “Does the bye-law lose all power over him directly he comes under the Factory Act?” The question arises in this way. By the Education Act, section 74, bye-laws may determine the time during which children are to attend school, “provided that no such bye-law shall be contrary to anything contained in any Act for regulating the education of children employed in labour.” The question is: does this proviso exempt children, who are attending school half-time under the Factory Acts, from the operation of compulsory bye-laws; or may such children be compelled to attend school full time by a bye-law? The point has been much argued, and by high authorities. Some say, the bye-law requirement is not “contrary to” the Factory Act requirement, but is merely an addition to it. The Factory Act does not declare “if you attend school half-time, you need not attend any more;” and it is only such a declaration that would be contravened by the bye-law declaration “you shall attend full time.” No statutory

right was given by the Factory Act to parents and employers to dispose of a child's time, so as to make that time sacred against invasion by the statutory powers given to school boards. The Factory Acts gave no rights. They only limited pre-existing rights. The other side say, if the proviso does not mean that factory children are exempt from bye-laws, it means nothing. It was certainly the intention of Parliament to exempt such children. The Factory Acts do not merely impose a *minimum* of school-attendance, which may be increased without their being contravened. They contain categorical declarations, that a child shall attend school in a certain manner; and it is absurd to say, that such declarations are not contradicted by bye-laws, declaring that he shall attend school in a totally different manner.

This question has recently come before the courts in the case of "Bury v. Cherrybohn," an appeal by the Barnsley school board against the magistrates, upon a summons issued under a bye-law. The judges (Bramwell, Mellor, and Denman) concurred in the decision, that a child was not the less amenable to a bye-law because he attended school in conformity with the Workshop Act. The grounds on which they based this decision were similar to those above stated as arguments in favour of the bye-laws. It should be mentioned that the case for the Workshop Act was not argued before the judges. The only counsel who appeared was for the bye-laws. The judges expressed their regret at this, stating that the question was altogether new to them; and it may, indeed, be doubted whether all the points of it were taken into account.

We have now seen, that the Factory Acts differ from each other in their educational provisions; that none of them agree with the Workshops Act, or the Mines Act, or the Agricultural Children Act, or the enactment relative to out-door relief; further, that no two of these agree with each other; further, that direct compulsion is only applied here and there through the country, in districts so locally situated as to make great confusion, and in such a variety of different manners and degrees that in no two places is it applied quite similarly; further, that difficult questions have arisen between the conflicting claims of direct and indirect compulsion. These facts seem to justify the statement with which we started, that the present law of compulsory education is confused and complicated, and embodied in a variety of Acts which certainly show no agreement, and perhaps show some actual conflict.

What the reform should be, is a question which we seem likely to have amply debated during this Session, and which there are sufficient reasons (even were there space for it) for not attempting to discuss in this paper. Some few principles, however, which seem almost of the nature of axioms may here, in conclusion, be set down.

By what considerations should the character of legislation upon any subject be determined? Surely by a consideration of the character of the persons who are to be the objects of it; of the prejudices which are to be encountered by it; of the good which may be hoped for from it—whether it would be a good universally, or merely a partial good, a good only to certain persons and in certain places and subject to other such limitations. Now, in legislation upon compulsory education, it is clear that the persons for whom the law is intended are the poorest, most ignorant, and stupidest of the population. But these are the very persons who can least understand complexities. And what is the prejudice to be encountered? Clearly the idea, that a man's children are his own, and that nobody from outside has a right to interfere between him and them. This is assumed to be a law of nature; and any positive law, which is to encounter it successfully, must approach as near as may be, in universality and simplicity, to the character of a law of nature. Then, as to the good to be looked for, all compulsion assumes education to be a good of such paramount and universal importance that the parent may no more refuse it, than he may refuse food, to the child. Yet we have legislated as if it was a thing of the value of which different views might be taken in different localities, a thing about which each group of ratepayers might form its own opinion, like systems of lighting, or draining, or paving; and though our legislation presupposed, and was necessarily based upon, the theory that education, like food, could not be refused to the child without criminality, we have so legislated as, in practice, to allow it to be refused with impunity to the child on one side of the street, and only to require it under penalties to be given to the child on the other side.

The above considerations seem to point to a uniform system of compulsion by one simple law. But this again is impossible. Laws, so full of inequalities and complexities as those we have described, cannot be made simple and equal at a stroke. No country ever did so much for education in the time as we have done during these last six years; and if for the tentative and piecemeal legislation, which has effected so much, there were suddenly to be substituted a rigidly uniform measure, the danger of reaction would be great. For some time yet, we must have breaches of uniformity; and neither of the two systems of direct and indirect compulsion can wholly give place to the other. The reasons are too strong for dealing differently with the two classes of children to which these systems respectively apply—the stray sheep, who have to be sought out individually, and the flocks who are “pounded” in places of labour, under an employer whom the law can get at.

JOHN WHITE.

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

THE important discussion in the Cortez at Madrid on the subject of liberty of conscience is a very fair guide to what the true ultramontanes would do, if they ever should get the mastery in Catholic countries. Since the fall of Queen Isabella Spain had tolerated the practice of dissenting faith and worship. Profiting by this toleration some English missionaries and a few Spaniards had set on foot a propagandist movement in favour of Protestantism. No religious agitation resulted from this, so far as the masses were concerned; the well-to-do classes were indifferent and the people ignorant. But in the great towns, at Madrid, at Seville, at Cordova, small Protestant societies were founded, comprising at the outside 7,000 or 8,000 true believers, if we may trust the common report, and possessing a certain number of places of worship, of very modest pretensions, and not at all of a kind to disturb the susceptibilities of the Roman clergy. There was no ground, therefore, for apprehending any abjuration of her ancient faith by Spain. But Rome could not bear that the Holy Land of Catholicism, which had in old days been preserved from heresy by the purifying fires of the stake, should now lose the glorious privilege of absolute religious unity. So the Pope addressed himself directly to the King, to remind him that the Church cannot admit freedom of worship, and that every sovereign who is a good Catholic is bound to punish without pity all those of his subjects who should be audacious enough to question the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility.

Although he was brought up by his mother and by the Jesuits, the young king Alphonso is not, according to all appearances either a bigot or fanatic, and the first minister, Signor Canovas, hardly dreamed of playing the part of Torquemada, merely to please the Vatican. But on the other hand, the restored monarchy which has in face of it a republican party, that is for the moment silenced but is still very powerful, ought to lean on the conservative elements, and at the very head of these are evidently to be placed the Catholic clergy. This was the situation of Napoleon III. in France all through his reign, and it would be the same with any other restored dynasty in that country. It would be indispensable to lean upon the clerical party. But the principles and the demands of the clerical party are incompatible with the ideas and the necessities of modern civilisation. To obey that party is to be undone. To resist it is to be left helpless in presence of the revolutionary parties. To attempt to go half way towards satisfying it, is to embrace a false position, engendering weakness, contradiction, and incoherency. Thus the moment a crisis breaks out, the government falls, because its only partisans are lukewarm and without devotion. Signor Canovas has laid before the Cortez a draft of a constitution, the second article of which gives to the Church all that it can ask, short of the violent proscription of all Protestants. And the terms of the law are so vague that it is easy to draw from it whatever one wishes, even

the interdiction of all dissenting worship. This is the text:—"The Catholic Apostolic Roman religion is the religion of the State. The nation undertakes to maintain its worship and its ministers. No one shall be molested or persecuted on Spanish soil for his political opinions, nor for his particular form of worship, so long as he keeps within the bounds of Christian morality. But no other ceremonies and no other public manifestations than those of the religion of the State shall be permitted."

Prayers and service in a church, a baptism, a public marriage, a burial according to the reformed ritual, are plainly "public manifestations" of a religion other than that of the State. They may therefore be forbidden. All that remains allowable, strictly speaking, is domestic worship and private gatherings, provided that authority does not choose to see in them a conspiracy against public security and the established order. The article proposed by Signor Canovas did not therefore set toleration on any sacred basis, far from that: rather is intolerance and arbitrary authority that are really founded. Nevertheless Rome and the Spanish clergy left no stone unturned to procure the defeat of Article II. Briefs from the Pope and sermons in the churches, petitions from the Spanish ladies, popular agitations, menaces of revolution,—nothing was spared.

The debate opened on May 3. One of the leaders of the reactionary party—called in Spain Moderados, though as a matter of fact they are partisans of every violent measure,—Signor Fernando Alvarez, formerly a minister of Queen Isabella, proposed the restoration of the intolerant system of the constitution of 1845, which sanctioned the imprisonment of the martyr Matamores because he read the Bible himself and tried to get others to read it. It was Catholic unity, said Signor Alvarez, that made the glory of Spain and preserved its nationality; without that, the country would perish in anarchy. His speech was loudly applauded by the galleries, but his proposal was rejected by 226 votes against 38. This is a measure of the strength of extreme ultramontaniam in the chamber. In the country this strength is quite great enough to intimidate the Government. On May 4, Signor Romero Ortiz in a remarkable speech defended the system of liberty of conscience. Even while accepting for the country the obligation of providing for the maintenance of the Catholic worship, he asked that the article of the Constitution should add:—"The public or private exercise of any other form of worship is for ever guaranteed to all strangers resident in Spain, without further limit than that their religion must be within the universal rules of morality and right. If any Spanish subjects profess a religion other than the Catholic, they, also, come within the limits of the foregoing paragraph." It is impossible to say less, if toleration is intended to be real and sheltered against all arbitrary measures from the government. Yet the ministry does not go so far, and through Signor Martin Herrera, the Minister of Justice, it resisted the proposal of the liberals, which was rejected. Castelar, in an admirable improvisation that provoked the enthusiastic applause of his very adversaries themselves, tried in vain to secure the acceptance of the principle of liberty of worship, the most precious, the most indisputably just, of all liberties. Signor Canovas del Castillo explained the motives that guided him in framing

Article II.; he protested his respect for the Concordat of 1851; appealed to the universal feeling of the nation, and while proclaiming the admissibility of dissenters to public employments, declared them to be excluded from all scholastic functions. The bill of the Government was voted by a great majority. But Signor Canovas was afraid of provoking the anger of the Holy Father. King Alphonso addressed to Pius IX. a very humble and contrite letter, in which he assures him that all the rights of the Church shall remain untouched. The Pope acknowledged the letter very coldly, and reserves all his rights. All this gives some idea of the degree of independence that is to be enjoyed by the civil power in any country. that desires to remain on good terms with Rome. King Alphonso should take care. If, in order to secure the support of the clergy, of the great nobles, and certain rural districts, he chills the liberal feeling of the large towns, which is a very powerful force, he will be compromising the future of his dynasty. By its literature and its journals, the action of France upon Spain is very great. So long as the Republic and liberal ideas carry the day on the north of the Pyrenees, it will be the height of imprudence to attempt a clerical reaction in the Peninsula. To do so would only be to sow the seed of a new revolution.

On the other side of the Atlantic the old Spanish colonies treat their mother, the Holy Church, with less deference. The republic of Ecuador, which was lately quoted by the Pope along with Belgium as a model state, has abruptly changed its course and broken with Rome. In Venezuela they have resolved that the Catholic faith is to lose all its privileges, and that the priests and bishops shall be chosen directly by the faithful. This is nothing less than an ecclesiastical revolution like that which took place at Geneva and in the catholic portion of the canton of Berne. When the population is sincerely devoted to the Church, as is the case in Ireland, such measures as these will not weaken the catholic hierarchy; but otherwise they are likely to provoke schisms.

The great event of the month is the meeting of the Chancellors of the three Empires at Berlin. Europe may congratulate herself on the results of the interview, for it furnishes—so they assure us—new guarantees for peace. Last month we tried to show two things. On the one hand, the views of Austria and Russia on the oriental imbroglio were palpably diverging, and that such divergences could not fail to become more sharply accented, if Servia and Montenegro took part in the struggle to support the cause of the insurgents. On the other hand, we showed that war could scarcely issue from these differences, because five out of the six great powers are keenly anxious for peace. Russia, who has always been accused of stirring up trouble and wishing for war, cannot really wish it, because there is no advantage that she could get from it. England, Austria, and Germany united would bar her road to Constantinople. Austria evidently desires peace for a hundred reasons that everybody can see for himself. Italy, if her statesmen do not altogether lose their heads, is devoted to peace for all time. England is pacific, because she is rich, commercial, humane, and sensible. France, become very sage since she

has been a Republic, is busy about her great industrial exhibition. As for Germany, she cannot fight by herself, and she is even making advances to France that are not absolutely repulsed. The manufacturers of the two nations are appointing a rendezvous at Paris in 1878, to dispute the laurel of industry and skill; not soldiers, to try the comparative destroying power of chassepot rifles and Krupp guns. Given therefore, on one side, divergences of view on the subject of Turkish affairs, and on the other the impossibility of settling them by the sword, the best plan for smoothing away difficulties was to examine them in common in close personal conversation. Hence the meeting at Berlin of Prince Gortschakoff, Prince Bismarck, and Count Andrassy, under the auspices of the two Emperors William and Alexander.

The first interview of the Emperors, which took place at the station, was extremely cordial. All Berlin made a holiday, and the reception of the Russian Emperor was enthusiastic. He deserved it, for both in 1866 and 1870 he showed himself Germany's most devoted friend. People observed with lively satisfaction that he seemed in good health, and that there was no need yet for disquiet as to the contingency of seeing him replaced by a successor less sympathetic towards German greatness. The Emperor William did the honours of the capital and of his great army with all the vigour of a young man, and seemed suddenly and wholly to have thrown off the indisposition which had hindered him only three weeks before from going to salute Queen Victoria. Years appear to have no hold on this German of the antique time. Prince Bismarck is less strong in health. He was unable to be present at the banquets and at the court receptions. But he worked most laboriously with the other two chancellors, between whom he had no great difficulty in keeping a good understanding. The points agreed upon are said to be these. An armistice for two months, during which the Turks and the Insurgents should preserve their respective positions. The maintenance of the Andrassy programme, to be completed by the addition of certain articles borrowed from the manifesto of the Insurgents. United action of the six great powers, to superintend the execution of the programme. If other measures should be indispensable, they should be taken after an understanding with the other powers. France and Italy are said to have given their adhesion, but England has refused.

The advantages gained by Mukhtar Pasha in the environs of Niksics have improved the position of Turkey by arresting the intervention of Servia, which had previously seemed very close at hand. But on the other hand the assassination of the consuls of France and Germany at Salonica is the symptom of a grave peril for the future. Mahometan fanaticism is in an excited mood on every side. At Damascus, at Smyrna, at Beyrout, at Constantinople even, foreigners are alarmed for their security, and are dispatching their families westward. For the moment, the telegraph brings us more reassuring news. But it is certain that a very slight incident would be enough to let loose Musulman rage, and in that case the independence of Turkey would be at an end. Nothing could then prevent the intervention of European troops and the occupation of the menaced points. Lord

Stratford de Redcliffe's letter to the *Times* newspaper shows what a feeling of antipathy Turkey is stirring in Europe. There is the most persevering champion of the integrity of the Ottoman empire, the statesman who was at the bottom of the Crimean War,—declaring that henceforth the independence of the Porte is an impossibility, and that Europe has no longer any interest in maintaining it. For twenty years, he says, Turkey has enjoyed complete peace at home and abroad. And to what condition has the Sultan's administration brought the country? It has produced bankruptcy; a disastrous insurrection; general disquiet; the intervention of foreign powers; and perhaps a European war. According to Lord Stratford, the evil being general, every local remedy must be impotent. The Porte must be forced to recognise the equality of all classes before the civil law, to reform the fiscal administration, to admit Christians into the army, to compose the council of state and also the provincial councils partly of no-Muslims, to establish a ministry of commerce. These reforms ought to be stipulated for with the Sultan, and their execution placed under the supervision of a mixed and responsible commission. What Lord Stratford seeks, therefore, is nothing short of the reduction of the Sultan to a condition of tutelage. But then, as has been said, it would be simpler and more effective to dethrone the Sultan, than to govern in his name.

These events show how completely Russia has been in the right in maintaining, as she has done for so many years, that the Sick Man is marching to his end, and that it would be right and expedient to arrange for the succession. It was because the Emperor Nicholas had a clear sight of all this, and because he confided to England the results of his diagnosis, that Lord Stratford worked for a declaration of war against him. The brilliant and glorious results of that war are before our eyes. It is Russia again who has the honours of the Berlin meeting. The Andrassy programme having come to nothing, it is now the Gortschakoff programme that is submitted to the powers, and in fact we may say that the direction of the moral pressure that is being exerted on the Porte has passed from the hands of Austria to the hands of Russia. This is the only advantage that Russia can *as yet* derive from oriental complications. She cannot dream of territorial conquests, but what she may desire is first that the Ottoman power should grow weaker, and that the Turkish empire should continue its process of disintegration; secondly, that she should figure in the eyes of all the Slaves as the champion of the future interests of their race. Russia secures these two advantages at the present moment. The Germans, and especially the Hungarians, are not fond of the Slaves. Austria, which is governed by Germans and Hungarians, does not show herself favourable to the complete emancipation of the Slaves. She gives succour to the refugees from the insurgent provinces. She does not pronounce against these provinces; nay, she even supports some of their demands from the humanitarian point of view, but she has no desire to see the establishment in the Balkan of an independent Slavic confederation. In a word, the policy of Austria is Hungarian policy. That of Russia is Slavic policy. It is inevitable, therefore, that all over the Slavic world,—among the Czechs, the Slavonians, the Croats, the Servians, the Montenegrins, the

Ruthenians, the Bulgarians,—Russia should be winning the popularity that Austria either cannot or will not dispute with her, by making herself frankly and ostentatiously the champion of Slavonia.

We see nearly always in the affairs of this world that the state which defends the good cause, the cause of the future, gains the day at last, even if it has to pass through never so severe an ordeal. Piedmont finished by attaining its end, in spite of the defeat of Novara, because it defended the cause of Italian nationality. Prussia had a similar destiny, in spite of the humiliations of Olmütz, because it represented Germanic unity. In the East, if we rise above the accidents and uncertainties of the passing hour, what is the future that offers itself to our sight? Evidently the close of Turkish domination, and the emancipation of the Slavic peoples. The moment is uncertain, but the accomplishment of the horoscope is assured. It may be that the present crisis is not mortal for Turkey, and that by means of concessions and compromises the insurrection may be appeased. It may be, too, that an explosion of Musulman fanaticism may impose upon the powers the duty of intervention, and the task of putting an end to a government that is no longer able to rein in the savage passions of its subjects. This is the region of the unknown and the accidental. But in one fashion or another the barbaric dominion of the Turk will cease. That is the theme that Russia preaches in season and out of season, and she has acted logically in consequence. Every day events show how right she has been, and augment her influence. The chief part properly falls to him whose vision is clearest. We now see that England has missed her way in the affairs of the East. It will be fortunate if she is able to turn with resolution into another path. The best way of annulling, or at least of counterbalancing, Russian influence in the East, by no means consists in trying to checkmate Russia, when she places herself at the service of humanity and the future. It is proper, on the contrary, to support her, and to act in the same direction, and if need be, to speak louder and more definitely. If things are rightly understood, there ought not to be in Eastern affairs the slightest element of dissension or conflict. Save certain slight shades of difference as to details of execution, the great powers ought to be of one mind in following the same end, the entire emancipation of the Balkan Peninsula; if a military occupation is indispensable, then it ought to be made by common agreement and at common cost. There is a rumour of laying this duty on the Italians. Italy has no business to derange the equilibrium of her budget, simply in order to fulfil gratuitously the functions of European policeman. Young states, like young men, are often in a great hurry to play any part that gives them importance. It is well to distrust these restless impulses of juvenile vanity. If intervention is necessary, as the interest concerned is a European interest, it is for Europe to pay the cost. Perhaps it would be no bad occasion to affirm identity of view and community of interests among the great powers. People often mock at those Europeans who dream of a United States of Europe, governed by an Amphictyonic council. Have we not under our eyes, on the subject of eastern affairs, something very like this? The three chancellors examine

the situation together ; they come to an agreement upon the resolution to be taken, they draw up a memorandum and submit it to the other powers. Is not this exactly the realisation of "European concert" ?

Such concert naturally tends to peace. The Emperor Alexander arrived at Berlin, bearing on his coat the crosses of the great orders of Prussia, Austria, and Russia. "Here," he says, placing his hand on these decorations, "is the base of my policy." At Pesth (May 18) in reply to the address of the Delegations, the Emperor Francis Joseph uses the following expressions :—"The events in the East have only strengthened my resolution and that of the two great neighbouring States to draw more closely and intimately the relations which have already existed between our Empires. I fully trust that by this, as well as by the united efforts and sincere co-operation of the other European Powers, peace will be maintained. I hope, likewise, that the efforts of the Powers to assist the Porte in its task of a lasting pacification of the insurgent provinces will not be without result."

France has less reason than any other power to take any but a cheerful view of things. She is now the most highly favoured power in Europe. Detached from foreign affairs, she watches with philosophic eye oriental complications where she has nothing to gain and little to lose. She crowns the designs for the Great Exhibition of 1878. It is the sign of a quiet conscience to venture on preparation for a future so remote. Two years ! What unforeseen fortunes, what catastrophes, may they bring ! The great advance in France consists in this : the nation is satisfied with its government, and the government has no fear of the nation—a novel state of things for France. The cause of the change is easy to understand. The revolutionary elements were intent before all things on the Republic. This they now possess, but they are still fearful of losing it. So they have become conservative. M. Gambetta, who commands the floods and hurricanes of the great democratic sea, imposes on it calm and respect for law. The royalists understand that monarchy could only be restored if the republic were to founder in a tempest of anarchy, and they are not fanatics enough to wish to erect the throne on the ruins of their country. It is only the extreme Bonapartists and the clericals who try hard to stir up trouble and confusion in the land. But they are powerless. So long as the peasant is content, Bonapartism can only make itself ridiculous. The peasants have no reason to overthrow a system that the very seasons and harvests seem to favour in a special manner. The established system is republican ; so they vote and will continue to vote for republicans.

Incidents that at another moment would have provoked serious agitation, have not troubled the deep and universal calm. M. Waddington proposes to restore to the representatives of the State the right of conferring the academic degrees that are requisite for the practice of law and of medicine. The mixed jury is suppressed. At the same time the private faculties and universities preserve perfect freedom in training their pupils. This is the rational system. It may be held that no diploma in proof of capacity is necessary to plead a cause or cure a patient, although this system, which has been tried in America and at Geneva, has not produced very good

results. But if we think that in the interests of the public, and above all in the interests of knowledge, certain guarantees are necessary, then it is evidently the office of the state to see that these guarantees are adequate and genuine. It is a question of a measure of police, and that is plainly exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Government. What is to be controlled is the studies in the private universities. It is a mockery to surrender this control to the very institutions which ought to undergo it. Yet this is the exorbitant privilege which the previous ministry in France had conceded to the Catholic universities. Now that the government seek to take it away from them, the bishops are setting to work to organize a religious agitation. First they held a rather noisy meeting in Paris. Then the clerical newspapers launched petitions to be signed by the faithful. They raised loud cries of persecution; they declared that violence is being done to all the great principles of property, freedom, equity. But their cries have found no echo. The bishops and their organs are left stranded, and the country remains perfectly tranquil.

M. Ricard, the excellent Minister of the Interior, has been suddenly cut off, and the Marshal, who decidedly is learning his part as constitutional President, replaces him by another member of the Left, from whom much is hoped, M. Marcère. The change was effected in such a way as to show that the machinery of the republican government is working with due regularity. The discussion on the Amnesty, and the funeral of M. Michelet, would prove, it was feared, too good opportunities to be missed by the Irreconcilables of the Chamber and the street, for stirring the excitable population of Paris, ready as it has so often been for any movement in the direction of opposition. Already the Bonapartist journals, on the watch for anything to disturb opinion, had announced that tumultuous gatherings would take place, that cries of *Vive l'amnistie* would be heard, and that there might even be an attempted insurrection. All passed off with unbroken order. At Versailles some speeches were made in favour of the Amnesty; one of them, that of M. Clémenceau was very remarkable. The proposal was defeated by an enormous majority. At Paris a considerable and sympathetic crowd followed the funeral procession of the famous historian, but the people, following the watchword of their chiefs, did not utter a single seditious cry. The Bonapartists and the clericals were reduced to saying that the present government has fallen off, and that it has no longer any of the energy of the men of 1830 and of 1848.

Germany is passing through an economic crisis of great severity. On all sides manufactories are closing; workmen are out of employment; commercial and financial houses are failing. The strain is intense, and it is general. Whence does it proceed? Some persons attribute it to the enormous armaments, and they declare that the German Empire must desire war in order to relieve itself of its burdens. This is a mistake. No doubt the military expenses of Germany and Austria are very considerable, and devour unproductively a portion of their available resources. We can only applaud, therefore, those who like Herr Adolf Fishhof of Vienna, propose a general system of reduced armaments; or those legislative

assemblies which, like the Austro-Hungarian Delegations, call for a diminution of the army by 30,000 men. But without a general agreement, that is not to be hoped for at such a time as this, no head of a state and no minister would be willing to take the responsibility of diminishing the defensive forces of his country. Germany does not succumb under the weight of her budget; she has no debts: her taxes are heavy, but not excessive, and they come in with regularity. The intensity of the industrial crisis across the Rhine depends on other causes. It is nothing short of an economic revolution that is coming to pass, and that has been precipitated by the five milliards of the indemnity. These milliards have made nobody the richer, but they entered abruptly into circulation, and being placed for the time at the disposal of the banks, they produced extensive facilities for credit. Hence resulted a prodigious and factitious expansion of industrial enterprises. On all sides joint-stock companies sprang into existence to realise sources of natural wealth of a very restricted kind: for relatively speaking, the country is not rich in resources. As the prices of everything went up, all these companies, all the manufacturers, all the merchants, all the shopkeepers, made money and spent it in proportion. There was an outburst of prosperity such as had never been seen before, and especially at Berlin. There population went up rapidly: accommodation fell short; houses and ground went for prices that were simply insensate. As there was not labour enough to meet this extraordinary development of production, wages became marvellously high.

As a consequence of this general spread of wealth, habits changed. In Germany all classes used to live simply. Products were only middling in quality, because people wanted them cheaply. Coming from London or Paris into Germany, you are struck by the commonness of the articles in the shop-windows. As those articles no longer answered the new requirements, orders were sent abroad. The rich families of Berlin sent for all their furniture and their finest clothes from Paris. They even brought French artisans to execute the joinery and decoration of the new buildings. The superiority of the French workman is so indisputable that even Prince Bismarck did not scruple to proclaim it in the open parliament. The excess of imports over exports soon turned the exchange against Germany, and money travelled back along the roads to France and England, whence the payment of the indemnity had brought it, contrary to the usual current of commerce. At the same time the German government, drawn on by the abstract theories of the economists, wished to supply a currency composed solely of gold, to the exclusion of silver. An exclusively gold currency may suit a country like England, which by its immense commerce commands the exchanges of the whole world, and draws to itself the precious metals of both hemispheres. It is open to such a country to take the metal that it prefers, though the exclusion of silver exposes it to frequent drains of gold, which are extremely troublesome, and though for its relations with India and China it has constant need of silver. Germany, which has not the commercial advantages of England, and which has nearly always the exchange against her, will have great difficulty in keeping her gold coinage. Of the 1200 million marks that the

Empire had coined, no less than one-third is said to have already gone abroad, and the rest is kept by the Banks, and they, in order to keep it, have to resort to high rates of discount. Credit therefore has become contracted. On the other side, Germany wished to regulate the issue of notes, and she called in the small ones. The result of this was a scarcity in the means of circulation, and the contraction of the exchanges. All this hastened and aggravated the crisis that must naturally have succeeded the excesses of speculation and the exaggerated expansion of business after 1870.

So long as Germany is bent on disputing with France and England for the division of the gold of which she stands in need as an instrument of exchange, she will find herself hampered. The medium of circulation will be scarce, and the different instruments of credit will fail in replacing it. Already at the present moment Germany does not succeed in selling the silver which she seeks to drive out of circulation. She has only sold about 100 millions of marks, and in so doing she has reduced the value of this metal 10 per cent.; she has troubled the money market of the whole world; forced France and her monetary allies and confederates to limit the coining of silver; and rendered extremely detrimental the remittances from India to England. Thus Germany has done harm to others as well as to herself. The penalty is an industrial crisis more intense than such a crisis in other countries. The best remedy to which Germany could resort would be to admit the two metals as legal standards. In this way she will always have enough, and she will not have to fetter credit, in order to keep it. It is to be regretted that the well-to-do classes are abandoning their habits of simplicity and thrift, which were one of the sources of German greatness and power. The imitation of the elegances of France and the sumptuosities of England, will not bring happiness or good fortune. Let her remember Frederick the Second; he wore threadbare clothes, but grudged nothing to science or schools.

The *Kulturkampf* against the Church is lulling. The government continues to expel, imprison, and fine a few obscure priests. But the Bishops hold their peace and wait upon events. They recently met at Echternach, where every year at Whitsuntide people indulge in a singular dance in honour of the patron saint of the place. The holy procession takes three leaps forward and two backwards. Is it in the same way that the hierarchy means to do battle with the imperial government? The Pope is said to be ill; he is declared to be growing weaker; and there is even a report that the representatives of the Powers at Rome met together to examine the choice of a successor. Meanwhile, the Holy Father continues to give to the true believers who visit him counsels of gentleness and Christian charity. In his last discourse he exhorted the Catholics to strive against heretics and infidels, and he recalled the exploits of their forefathers in the Albigensian crusade, that first edition of the Bartholomew massacre, which drowned in blood the poetry and civilisation of Provence. How is the Pope to escape such ideas? Every day in the Vatican he traverses the Sala Regia, consecrated to the triumph of the Church, where Vasari painted by order of Gregory XIII. three frescoes representing the principal episodes of the St. Bartholomew and the massacre

of the Huguenots—which made Stendal say that the palace of the popes is the only place in the world where assassination is publicly glorified.

Turning to England, we find little to notice. The fate of the opposition to the change in the Royal Title justifies our estimate of the extremely moderate amount of popular feeling in the matter. Lord Hartington showed his usual sound judgment in checking the anxiety of some of his followers or colleagues to fight a hot battle upon a question about which the liberals in the country have for the most part held a half-cynical neutrality. Surely a political party loses its self-respect in expending so much virtuous indignation on one of the most ridiculous trifles that ever raised a debate, instead of reserving its force for some real attack on popular institutions or liberal principles. Members of parliament, liberals no less than conservatives, constantly mistake the bustle and gossip and feverishness of Westminster and Pall Mall for public emotion. They excite and fret one another, and then think that their friends in the constituencies are excited and fretted in the same degree. The constituencies are really attending to their daily business like sensible men, and prudently decline to be alarmed or exasperated by every storm which it may suit pushing politicians to raise in the Westminster tea-cup. One incident in the unedifying episode of the new addition to the Queen's titles deserves to be regretted. Mr. Lowe allowed himself to make a statement as to the Queen's having proposed this addition to her title to two previous ministers, who declined to meet her wishes. Mr. Disraeli was able to show this to be an error, and Mr. Lowe had to apologise. There is no more disagreeable sight in public life than thus to see a man of true public spirit, fine scientific intellect, and signal honesty, receive even a passing humiliation from a man with such a political character as the present Prime Minister.

The defeat of the government on the Irish Sunday Closing resolution was the most really satisfactory vote of the session (May 12); and this not at all *because* it was a defeat of government. From that point of view it was wholly insignificant. A majority of the Irish people desire a law to close public houses in Ireland on a Sunday. This is clearly a domestic matter, just as the similar law which the Scottish people have for Scotland is a domestic matter. If the Scotch have a Forbes Mackenzie Act, because they asked for it, why should not the Irish have a similar kind of law when they ask for it? The affirmation by the House of Commons of Mr. Smyth's resolution, declares that they ought to have such a law if they wish. Every man must welcome this sign of political right-mindedness, who attaches any sense to the principle of parliamentary representation, or who values popular government, or who distrusts legislative centralisation, or who knows the meaning of political expediency. The Irish representatives are practically unanimous; so are the Irish people. The latter proposition has been denied. If they were unanimous, it has been said, the public houses would close of themselves, because nobody would go to them. The gross miscarriage of thought here is obvious. What the Irish people are unanimous in desiring is that the temptation and opportunity of Sunday drinking should be withdrawn by legislative interference.

This is a very different thing from being unanimous in possessing strength of will enough to resist the temptation. Upon the merits of the question we pronounce no opinion. It may be inexpedient that the majority should coerce the minority into sobriety, and it may be unwise to do anything to interfere with the cheerfulness and recreation of the one holiday of the week, though the cheerfulness of wives and children ought to be taken into account as well as that of the husband. However these things may be, the whole question is just one of those which a country holding those relations to the imperial government which Ireland holds to England and Scotland, should be allowed to settle for itself. It is nonsense to talk of Ireland as being "an integral portion of the empire for legislative purposes" in the sense that she has as little claim to have her special wishes consulted as if she were Dorsetshire. As if to shut our eyes to vital differences of religion, differences of temperament, differences of tradition, were to efface them.

Just as those who desire a more extensive application of the principles of popular self-government to Ireland might have rejoiced if Mr. Smyth's resolution had been rejected, so those who, like ourselves, hope to see the Church of England disestablished, may rejoice at the kind of opposition offered by such men as Lord Salisbury to the resolution of Lord Granville in favour of opening the national churchyards. If a workman had made a speech on some labour question as remarkable for political blindness and prejudice and irritating heat of expression as was Lord Salisbury's speech on the Burial Resolutions, we should have heard how unfit the labouring classes are for the possession of political power. However, Lord Salisbury's gibes will not hinder him from being, whether he likes it or not, a participator in the measure which his government will bring in upon the subject next year.

The Bill for extending elementary education is another and a characteristic specimen of recent Conservative legislation, of which the Merchants Shipping Bill and the Bill for constituting a High Court of Appeal are prominent examples. It is evidently a mistake to call such measures reactionary, for modern Toryism has not purpose or definiteness enough for even backward movement, but leaves this congenial exertion to the too moderate politicians of the Liberal party. Our Conservatives are happiest in contemplative inaction, and if public opinion on any subject applies a gentle pressure, they stagger aimlessly forward, till the impetus is exhausted and a fresh resting-place is temporarily secured.

Lord Sandon's statement was a complete admission that compulsion is necessary in England to secure the universality of primary instruction. To most persons the confession suggests, as a natural consequence, direct compulsion applied through representative machinery. The experience of Scotland, and of the working of the Education Act of 1870, which has placed more than ten millions of the population under compulsory bye-laws, is a sufficient answer to those who assert that such a prescription would necessarily be unpopular or ineffective. The expedient is however too simple and straightforward to form the groundwork of a conservative policy.

If compulsion be inevitable, at least it can be called by some other name ; and accordingly a cumbrous disguise is found which will impede its action, but may conceal its real character and intention. Under present circumstances, educationists must be thankful for small mercies, and they will perhaps find ground for the hope that, if the Bill becomes law, it will do something to reduce the great mass of ignorance which past legislation has failed to reach. But the clumsy devices by which this end is sought to be accomplished are certain to produce a new crop of difficulties and objections which cannot be contemplated without dismay.

Lord Sandon acknowledges that 1,800,000 children are still without any satisfactory education, and his first object appears to have been the discovery of a method of enforcing compulsion without the establishment of School Boards, which are the *bête noire* of the denominationalists, and which they have done their best to render unpopular by the most persistent misrepresentation of their cost. Accordingly the Bill provides that Town Councils and Boards of Guardians may, under certain circumstances, make and enforce Compulsory Bye Laws in districts where no School Board has been elected. As regards Town Councils, there seems to be no objection to this proposal, provided that the powers conferred on School Boards for the provision and maintenance of schools are given to these bodies at the same time as the power to make bye-laws. In this way any deficiency in the accommodation, arising from the growth of the population, or the abandonment of existing schools, will be supplied ; and the Town Councils will act as School Boards in all respects, without the expense of a separate election and an independent staff of officials. Boards of Guardians, however, stand on a very different footing. By the mode of their election, coupled with the provisions which constitute a number of *ex officio* guardians, these bodies now represent property. The working-class and the agricultural labourers, who are chiefly interested in the work these authorities are to be called on to perform, have absolutely no voice in their election. The Government, which has always professed so tender a regard for individual liberty, actually proposes to subject millions of the population to the operation of compulsory laws, enforced by an authority on which they are entirely unrepresented.

As if to make the process still more unpalatable, the Boards are permitted to delegate their powers to a Committee of three, which may be expected to consist of the squire, the parson, and their nominee. This trio will be able to compel all the children in the Parish to attend the existing denominational schools, which in the majority of cases will be those connected with the Church of England. Even this may be better than that the children should remain ignorant, but it is a singular mode of popularising education in the rural districts. And the opposition which it will be certain to provoke is likely to compel resort to the alternative of indirect compulsion, which seeks to extort from parents a present sacrifice under threat of a deferred penalty. A "labour pass" indicating the attainment of a certain very limited proficiency is to be exacted from all children before they are permitted to go to work. Passing over the miserably low standard at which the test is fixed, and the extraordinary

provision that when a child has once obtained a certificate he may be taken into employment in any subsequent year, without any further certificate being required—a provision which, for the first four years after the passing of the Act, will enable a child under fourteen to be employed if he has passed the second standard of the revised code—it is clear that the requirements of the Bill will be eluded by all children working at home and under domestic control. And even when this is not the case, it is unlikely that the indifferent, ignorant, and apathetic parents, who are, *ex hypothesi*, the subjects of the measure, will provide education for their children in view of the distant contingency that in from five to ten years later they may wish them to go to work. Thus the Bill will create an immense class of children who do not go to school and may not go to work. The only provision for dealing with them is contained in the clauses for securing their committal to industrial schools. Here is indeed a hopeful prospect! The experience of these institutions shows that, in spite of the terms on which committals are made and of the exertions of officers specially appointed for the purpose, it is found impossible to collect from the parents more than a fraction of the cost of maintenance; and if the community is about to undertake the provision of food and clothing for all children whom parental neglect has condemned to ignorance, a direct inducement will be offered for such negligence, and an expenditure incurred before which the alleged extravagance of School Boards will pale its ineffectual fires. Besides, the existing industrial schools are nearly full, and there is no obligation in any one to provide more. Where, then, is the accommodation to be found for the vast multitude of “wastrel” children whom Lord Sandon proposes to manufacture in this wholesale way? And, lastly, what will be the effect on these children of their close association with others of the quasi or actual criminal class?

The great merit of the Bill is negative. It contains none of the provisions so confidently expected by the ultra-denominationalists for restricting the discretion of School Boards as to religious teaching, and for relieving the subscribers to voluntary schools of their share of the education rate. The only concession made is the removal of one of the limitations to the amount of grant earned in what are defined as “poor districts.” It is a curious evidence of the blundering way in which the Bill has been prepared that under the definition given the great Borough of Birmingham will be a “poor district,” while the agricultural county of Dorset will be deemed a rich one. But in any case the boon, like the half-hour conceded to those other pillars of the Conservative administration—the publicans, is illusory and valueless. The amount deducted last year under the limitation which it is now proposed to remove was under £12,000, and this sum will hardly pay the National Society for the cost of the agitation by which it has been secured.

May 29, 1876. ;

• THE

FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.

—
No. CXVIII. NEW SERIES.—OCTOBER 1, 1876.
—

PRESENT ASPECTS OF THE EASTERN QUESTION.

YEARS instead of months seem to have passed since, in last December, I wrote in this Review under the heading "The True Eastern Question." A revolt against Turkish oppression was then going on in Bosnia and Herzegovina, a revolt which shewed to all who kept their eyes open that the long-oppressed Slavonic subjects of the Turk had fully made up their minds to throw off his yoke once and for ever. To those who had eyes to see, the insurrection which began last summer marked the beginning of an æra in the history of the world. It marked that the wicked power of the Turk was doomed. From the stern determination with which the insurgents drew the sword, from the deep and universal sympathy with their cause among their free neighbours of the same blood and speech, it was plain that this revolt was no mere local or casual disturbance, but the beginning of a great uprising of a mighty people. It was plain that a ball had been sent rolling which would grow as it rolled; it was plain that a storm had burst which must in the end sweep away before it the foul fabric of oppression which European diplomatists had been so long vainly and wickedly striving to prop up. When I wrote in December last, as when I wrote on these matters twenty years back, I wrote as one of a small band, maintaining an unpopular view. We looked for no general approval; we were rejoiced if we could find so much as a stray listener here and there. The cause which I had then in hand was one which Governments pooh-poohed and about which the world in general was careless. I then set forth, as I had often set forth before, as I do not doubt that I shall often have to set forth again, the true nature of Ottoman rule, the causes which make it hopeless to look for any reform in Ottoman rule, the one remedy by which only the evils of Ottoman rule can be got rid of—by getting rid of the Ottoman rule itself. In that article, I pleaded for the oppressed Christian; but I also bore in mind the danger lost, in delivering the

oppressed Christian, a way might be opened for the oppression of the Mussulman. I said then that the direct rule of the Turk must cease in every land whose inhabitants had risen against his rule. I said that, as Bosnia and Herzegovina had risen, his rule must at once cease in Bosnia and Herzegovina; that when Albania and Bulgaria should rise, his rule must cease in Albania and Bulgaria also. I said that the least that could be accepted was the practical setting free of the revolted lands by making them tributary states like Servia and Roumania. But I also proposed, in the special interest of the large Mahometan minority in Bosnia, that that particular province should be annexed to the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, as a power strong enough to hinder the professors of either religion from doing any wrong to the professors of the other. When I said this, there was still only a local warfare in two provinces, a warfare waged by the people of those provinces, goaded to revolt by intolerable wrongs, and strengthened only by private volunteers from the lands immediately around them. It was not till several months later that there was any Bulgarian insurrection, any national war on the part of Servia and Montenegro. Meanwhile the Turk was engaged in his usual work of putting forth lying promises, promises in which the men who had risen against him were far too wise to put trust for a moment. Meanwhile diplomatists were engaged in their usual work of pooh-poohing the great events whose greatness they could not understand. They were busy with their usual nostrums, their petty palliatives, their Andrassy Notes and their Berlin Memorandums. Feeble attempts indeed to stop the torrent were their proposals for this and that reform, for this and that guaranty. Such were the sops which they thought might be swallowed either by the tyrant whose one object was to get back his victims into his clutches, or by the men who had sworn to die rather than again bow their necks under his yoke. While diplomatists were wondering and pottering, men were acting. Servia and Montenegro at last came openly to the help of their brethren, and helpless ambassadors and foreign secretaries found themselves face to face with a national war and no longer with a local insurrection. And meanwhile, if men had been acting, fiends had been acting also. Bulgaria rose; how its rising was put down the world knows, in spite of the self-made Earl of Beaconsfield. And, when the world knew, the world shuddered and the world spoke. It had been hard to call public attention to what seemed to many merely a petty strife in lands whose names they had hardly heard. The old traditions also had to be struggled with. Englishmen had to be taught what their dear ally the Turk was, what he had ever been, what he ever must be. The "Russian hobgoblin" had to be laid, and with many

minds it was hard work to lay it. For months and months the few who had their eyes open were still preaching in the wilderness. At last the Turk did our work for us. He told a shuddering world what he really was in words stronger than any that we could put together. He painted his own picture on the bloody fields of Bulgaria in clearer colours than we could ever have painted it. The common heart of mankind was stirred. We who had before been preaching in the wilderness found a hearing in market-places and in council-chambers. What we had whispered in the ear in closets was now preached on the house-tops by a mighty company of preachers. Great statesmen put forth with voice and pen the same facts, the same arguments, for which, nine months before, it was hard to get a hearing. All England spoke with one voice, a voice which spoke in the same tones in every corner of the land save two. It was only from the beer-shops of Oxford and the Foreign Office at Westminster that discordant notes came up. While the rest of England was speaking the words of truth and righteousness, Lord Derby was still putting forth fallacies, while his Oxford admirers raised an inarticulate howl which was not more unreasonable than the fallacies of their chief. Those who, in season and out of season, have fought this battle for twenty years and more, may perhaps be indulged in a little feeling of triumph when they see that the world has at last come round to their side. England, so long the abettor of the Turk, has at last found out what the Turk is. The nation has awakened from its slumber; it has cast away its fetters; it has dared to open its eyes and to use its reason; it has declared as one man that England will no longer have a share in maintaining that foul fabric of wrong, that Englishmen will put up with nothing short of the deliverance of the brethren against whom they have, as a nation, so deeply sinned.

The people of England have spoken; but it is not enough that the people should speak. Their rulers must be made to act; and just now we have rulers whom it is very hard to goad to action—at all events to action on behalf of right. The *Times* says that Lord Derby must be “educated,” and it even implies that the work of his “education” has already begun. The process seems likely to be a slow one. When the proposal was laid before him that the revolted lands should be set free from the rule of the Turk, he said that he had no objection to such an arrangement, but that there were “difficulties.” Of course there are difficulties in the way of so doing, as in the way of everything else. The world is full of difficulties. Human life chiefly consists in meeting with difficulties, and in yielding to them or overcoming them as the case may happen. Only with men the existence of difficulties is something which stirs them up to grapple with the difficulties and to overcome them; with diplomatists

the existence of difficulties is thought reason enough for drawing back and doing nothing. And there is one difficulty above all difficulties in the way of vigorous and righteous action on the part of England in this matter. That difficulty is the existence of Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Derby. Lord Beaconsfield we all know; Lord Derby most of us are beginning to know. A few zealous county members still express their confidence in him: but they express it in that peculiar tone which men put on when they are trying to persuade themselves that they still put confidence in something in which they have really ceased to put confidence. But with the world in general the strange superstition that Lord Derby is a great and wise statesman is swiftly and openly crumbling away. It is wonderful indeed to see the change of public opinion on this head. Two or three months back it was the acknowledged creed of Liberals as well as of Conservatives that Lord Derby was to be treated with a degree of respect with which there was no need to treat any of his colleagues. Things are indeed changed now that the *Times* talks of "educating" him, now that the comic papers jeer at him, now that his name is spoken of, certainly not with any great respect, in writing and in speech throughout the whole land. The sagacious minister, respected on both sides, trusted on both sides, is no longer spoken of with the bated breath which was held to be the right thing even when the present year was a good deal advanced. When the English people are driven really to look into any matter, their sight is sharp enough, and they can see that a man whose one object is to do nothing is not the right man to be at the helm when there is a great work to be done. For my own part, if my own opinion of Lord Derby has changed, it has rather changed for the better. I am beginning to think that a man whom I had for ten years looked on as wicked may perhaps after all have been only stupid. It is a fact, and a very ugly fact, that we have to look to the betrayer of Crete for the redress of the wrongs of Bulgaria. A good deal of education will certainly be needed before we can make such an instrument serve our purpose. But, as regards the man himself, his treatment of the whole matter since the summer of last year suggests the thought that, even in the Cretan business, Lord Derby may have been simply frightened and puzzled, and may not have meant any active mischief. But the mischief was done all the same; it may have been only in fright and puzzlement that he gave the order; but the order was given none the less; the women and children of Crete were none the less left, and left by his bidding, to the mercy of their Turkish destroyers. Lord Derby, in the face of one of the great epochs of the world's history, reminds one of nothing so much as the Lord Mayor before whom Jeffreys was brought after the flight of James the Second. "The Mayor," says Lord Macaulay, "was a

simple man who had spent his whole life in obscurity, and was bewildered by finding himself an important actor in a mighty revolution." Lord Derby had not passed his whole life in obscurity; but he seemed just as much bewildered at finding that he had to play a part in a great European crisis as ever the simple Mayor could have been. The result in the two cases is indeed different. The Lord Mayor, being doubtless an impulsive man, "fell into fits and was carried to his bed, whence he never rose." Lord Derby is not impulsive; so he bore up, and made speeches for Mr. Gladstone to tear into shreds.

From the first to the last utterance of Lord Derby on these matters, from his dispatch of August 12, 1875, to his speech of September 11, 1876, the same characteristic reigns throughout. That characteristic is blindness. In the first dispatch and in the last speech there is the same incapacity to understand what it is that is going on. On August 12, 1875, the insurrection had been at work for more than a month, and Consul Holms and Sir Henry Elliot had been sending home accounts, not of course of what really had happened, but of what this and that Turk told them had happened. The Turks were of course busy lying, and Safvet Pasha was lying with greater vigour than all the rest; for he was saying that some Turk—who was sent for the purpose of bamboozling men who would not be bamboozled—would "redress well-founded complaints." But this Turk had clearer notions of what was going on than Lord Derby had. He writes to say that the insurrection is daily assuming more serious proportions, that Dalmatia sympathizes and helps, that Dalmatians and Montenegrins join the patriot ranks, that the position of the Servian army looks awkward, that neither Austria nor Montenegro is acting exactly as the interests of Turkish tyranny would have them act. That is to say, the die had been cast; Eastern Europe had risen; warping had been given to the foul despot at the New Rome that the hour of vengeance was come. The Turk saw and trembled; Lord Derby shut his eyes and pattered. All that he could see was a local disturbance in Herzegovina. So when the first little band of the followers of Mahomet drew the sword, the ruler of Rome and Persia saw nothing but disturbances in a distant corner of Arabia. In Lord Derby's eyes all that was to be done was to stop disturbances, to hinder Servians, Montenegrins, and Dalmatians from joining in the disturbances. Then come the memorable words,—

"Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that the Turkish Government should rely on their own resources to suppress the insurrection, and should deal with it as a local outbreak of disorder, rather than give international importance to it by appealing for support to other powers."

Poor blind diplomatist! So Leo the Tenth looked calmly on the

theological disorder which began with the teaching of a despised monk called Martin Luther. So Antiochos of Syria and Philip of Spain thought for a moment that not much could come of the local disorders which were stirred up by the Maccabees and the Silent Prince. In Lord Derby's eyes the glorious uprising of oppressed nations was simply a thing to be "suppressed." He wished it to be suppressed; he thought that it could be suppressed, he would fain have seen the tyrant again press his yoke upon his victims, without seeking the support of other powers. The very phrase shewed that Lord Derby did not shrink from the possibility that the tyrant might be aided by other powers in his work of evil. What is meant by a Turkish government "suppressing a revolt by its own resources" we know full well now. Lord Derby himself, in spite of manful efforts to remain in ignorance, must himself know by this time. I will not believe that Lord Derby really wished Herzegovina to be dealt with then as Bulgaria has been dealt with since. But that is the literal meaning of his words, when he hopes that the revolt may be put down by the resources of the Turkish Government. Lord Derby could not tell then what was to happen in Bulgaria months afterwards; but, if he ever turned a page of modern history, if the man who talks thus calmly of Turkish suppression of insurrections had read the annals of the Turk even in our own century, he might have known what Turks have done in suppressing insurrections, and even in dealing with lands where there had been no insurrections. He had the same chance as other men of reading the bloody annals of Chios and Cyprus and Kassandra. Whether Lord Derby knew it or not, it was to the doom which had fallen on Chios and Cyprus and Kassandra, to the doom which was to fall on Bulgaria, that Lord Derby calmly sentenced the patriots of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Let the insurrection be suppressed—that is, in plain words, let every foul deed of malignant fiends be wrought through the length and breadth of the revolted lands;—then there would be no difficulties, no complications, no openings of the Eastern Question; the Turk would have his way; the Foreign Office need not be troubled, and the Foreign Secretary of England might safely slumber at his post.

But so it was not to be. The hopes of Lord Derby were doomed to be disappointed. To suppress the insurrection was not quite so easy a matter as he had deemed and hoped. The mighty outburst of freedom was soon to put on "international importance," even in the eyes of diplomatists. The resources of the Turkish Government failed to put out the fire which had been kindled. The men who had drawn the sword for right and freedom were not to be overthrown in a moment, even though their overthrow was needed to save the English Foreign Office from difficulties and complications. Deeper and deeper grew the resolve of the champions of right to listen to none of the lying promises of their tyrant,

to listen to none of the feeble suggestions of diplomatists, but to fight on in the face of Heaven and Earth, in the cause of Heaven and Earth. They have fought on; even before their independent brethren came to their help, they had beaten back every assault of the barbarian invader. For months and months the boasted resources of the Turkish Government were unable to suppress the insurrection, unable to overcome the resistance of that little band of warriors, warriors worthy to rank with the men who gathered round Alfred at Athelney, or round Hereward at Ely. Down to this moment the insurrection has not been suppressed; Herzegovina has not been won back by the barbarian. The native heroes of the land, strengthened by their brethren from the Black Mountain, still stand victorious on the soil which they have won from the barbarian, and which the barbarian has failed to win back from them. The suppression of the insurrection which Lord Derby wished for is still, in September, 1876, as it was in August, 1875, a thing which diplomatists may long for, but which freedom has but little reason to fear.

But meanwhile another insurrection has been suppressed; and now the world knows what Turkish suppression of insurrections means. The tale of Bulgarian wrongs need not be told again. Lord Beaconsfield himself perhaps knows by this time how "an oriental people" have done what all the world, except Lord Beaconsfield, knows to be the manner of "an oriental people." They have done as the barbarians of the East have ever done, since the Hebrew put his Ammonite captives under saws and under axes of iron, and made them to pass through the brick-kiln. The Turk has done after his kind; and the voice of England, the voice of mankind, has pronounced sentence on him and his abettors. Servia, which for a moment seemed to have been overthrown in her glorious struggle, still holds her own, and every moment that she holds her own makes it more certain that she will not long be left without a helper. The mightiest people of her race will soon be on the march for her deliverance. Lord Derby, who, thirteen months back, was thinking of suppressing insurrections, will soon have to think what he will do when the myriads of Russia come to the help of their brethren in blood and faith. They have come already; despotism itself has its bounds, and the peace-loving Czar either cannot or will not keep back his people from what in their eyes is the holiest of crusades. It has come to this, that Englishmen are prepared to see Russia step in and do the work that England should have done. If the Russians ever occupy Constantinople, it will be Lord Derby who has placed them there.

It is hardly worth while to go again through the whole tale of ministerial incapacity, to use the mildest words. Lord Beaconsfield is true to his creed of Asian mysteries. He seeks his models among

the ancient worthies of his own people. Truly he looks to Abraham his father and unto Sarah that bare him. Like his great ancestress, he takes such pains to assure us that he did not laugh as to provoke the retort, "Nay, but thou didst laugh." He recalls too at least one exploit of his great ancestor in the zeal with which he flies to the help of the rulers of Sodom and Gomorrah. It is hardly needful again to refute the base slanders of the tongue which spoke of the doings of the tyrant and of the patriot as equal in guilt, and which affected to see nothing but hankering after "provinces" in the high resolve of the Servian people to do or die for right. Over and over again has Lord Derby told us that he did not, and could not, have directly instigated the Turkish doings in Bulgaria. Over and over again has it been explained to him that nobody ever thought that he had directly instigated them, that he is the last man whom anybody would suspect of directly instigating anything. But over and over again has it also been explained to him that he has none the less made himself an abettor and an accomplice after the fact, by keeping the English fleet in a position which all mankind but himself believed to be meant as a demonstration in favour of the evil cause. There is no need again to answer such fallacies as the memorable argument that, because Christians, Mahometans, and Hindoos could live peaceably together under the English government of India, therefore Christians and Mahometans can peacefully live together under the Turkish government of South-Eastern Europe. Lord Derby's earlier talk has become a thing of the past. In the process of his education he may already have got beyond it; he may be educating himself backward to the days when his words on Turkish matters were somewhat different from his recent acts. But Lord Derby himself is unhappily a thing of the present, and some of his later sayings are still matters of practical importance. At the moment when I write, Servian and Turk are resting on their arms. An effort is being made to bring about peace between them, a peace in the negotiation of which a representative of England cannot fail to take a leading part. It is a matter for anxious and painful thought that the representative of England at such a moment should be a man who, with whatever motives, through whatever causes, whether through sheer indifference or sheer incapacity, has, as a matter of fact, made himself guilty of the blood of Crete and Bulgaria.

First of all, there was something very ominous, though perhaps from one side a little reasoning, in one of the latest sayings of Lord Derby. He told his hearers that one of the great principles on which he acted was "strict neutrality while the war lasts." Taken in itself, this last saying of Lord Derby's is of a piece with his first saying about the suppression of the insurrection. According to Lord Derby, England, which, in common with the other great powers, is bound to be the protector of the Christian subjects of the Turk,

England, which is morally bound above all the other great powers to undo the wrongs which she has herself done to them, is to be strictly neutral while the war lasts—that is, under no circumstances is she to go beyond remonstrance, be the doings of the barbarians towards their victims what they may. On no account, in no state of things, is the arm of England to be stretched out to give real help to the oppressed. Come what may, let victorious sayages change the whole of South-Eastern Europe into a howling wilderness, England must not lift a weapon to hinder them. Come what may, we must never do again the good work which we ourselves did at Algiers, which France did in Peloponnesos, which England, France, and Russia joined to do on the great day of Navarino. While Lord Derby has his way, England is never again to strike another blow for right. Such is the frame of mind in which the representative of England approaches the negotiations for peace. Still there is another side, even to his blank and chilling words. Who does not remember how Lord Derby, not so very long ago, comforted himself and others by saying the war was not likely to spread? Perhaps the world has by this time learned that Lord Derby's auguries as to probability and improbability in such matters are not quite worth so much as they were once thought to be. In defiance of his infallible powers of divination, the war has spread, the war is spreading, and he that has eyes to see must see that, if it be not stopped by a real and not a sham peace, it will soon spread further still. The last reserve of Servia, as the *Times* called it not long back, will soon be drawn out. Russia will have come to her deliverance. We wish for no such thing—at least it is only Lord Derby who has driven us to wish for it. We had rather see the South-Eastern lands free themselves, or be freed by English help, than see them either the subjects, the dependents, or even the grateful clients, of a power which has hitherto promised them so much and done for them so little. But unless Western diplomacy, Western arms, Western something, is quicker than it has been hitherto, that will be the upshot of all. And here we can draw some comfort even from Lord Derby's talk about neutrality. Strict neutrality while the war lasts must, in the common use of language, imply strict neutrality when the war, which was once confined to Herzegovina, which has spread from Herzegovina to Servia, shall have spread from Servia to Russia. Lord Derby has at least promised us that there shall not be another Russian war. If he has bound himself to do nothing for the oppressed, he has equally bound himself to do nothing against their avengers.

From Lord Derby indeed this is something. Still this elaborate ostentation of neutrality is not exactly the frame of mind in which we should wish to see our representative going forth to the negotiations by which it is hoped that the peace of South-Western Europe

may be secured. But Lord Derby, we are told, is capable of education; he has himself talked of listening to the will of his "employers." Now his employers have told him one thing very plainly. They have told him that they will not put up with any sham peace, that they will not put up with any patched-up peace, designed simply to stave off any serious settlement, and to let the diplomatists slumber for a few years longer. His employers, his teachers, have broken with the rotten traditions of the last two or three generations; and, if he wishes to be looked on as their servant or their pupil, he must break with them too. The people of England sees, whether Lord Derby sees it or not, that negotiations on the basis of the *status quo*, negotiations on the basis of merely communal freedom for the revolted lands, negotiations on any terms which imply the direct rule of the Turk, are not only wicked, but foolish. Negotiation on any of these terms is a crime, because it is an attempt to prolong a state of things which is contrary to the first principles of right. But it is more than a crime; it is a blunder; because it is an attempt to prolong a state of things which cannot be prolonged. To prolong the *status quo*, to grant a merely communal freedom, means to prolong the domination of the Turk. The domination of the Turk means that the nations of south-eastern Europe are to remain bondmen in their own land, denied, not merely the political rights of freemen, but the common rights of human beings. It means that the vast mass of the people of the land shall remain in a condition of permanent subjection to a handful of barbarian invaders; it means that at any moment the caprice of these invaders may turn that permanent subjection into a reign of terror, a reign of every excess of insult and outrage and fortune that the perverse wit of an "oriental people" can devise. This state of things Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Derby, if left to themselves, will prolong. If they are left to settle matters in their own way, the owls of Bulgaria and Herzegovina will never complain of a lack of ruined villages. Mark that the best thing that Lord Derby has ever said, his nearest approach that he has made to an acknowledgement of the existence of such things as justice and freedom, is when he said that he had "no objection" to exchange this state of things for a better. He has no objection to the change; but he clearly will not do anything actively to bring it about. But Lord Derby's employers and educators are of a different mind; they not only have no objection to a change, but they have the strongest objection to the continuance of the *status quo*. Sir Stafford Northcote lately took on himself to say that the people do not understand questions of foreign policy. They have shown that they understand them a great deal better than Sir Stafford Northcote or Lord Derby. They see that, if the *status quo* be maintained, if anything short of practical independence be given to the revolted lands, the whole tragedy will soon be

played over again. There will be more insurrections, more wars, more massacres, and, more awful still, more diplomatic "difficulties" and "complications." The people of England demand that, now that the Eastern question is "opened," it shall be settled; they know that settlements of this kind are no settlements at all, but simply wretched shifts to stave off a settlement. The people of England have, with one voice, declared that, however much Mr. Baring may satisfy Sir Henry Elliot, however much Sir Henry Elliot may satisfy Lord Beaconsfield, none of them will satisfy the common employers of all, if they attempt to make a settlement on any terms short of the practical independence of the revolted lands. Those lands must be separated from the direct rule of the Turk. Last December I pleaded for the separation of Bosnia and Herzegovina; to this demand the universal voice of England has added the separation of Bulgaria, while not a few voices have added the separation of Crete. If Lord Derby enters on any legislation with the faintest purpose of accepting any terms short of these, he will show that his education has not yet been carried at all near to the point at which his progress will satisfy his employers.

At this time of day it is perhaps hardly needful to answer objections about forsaking the traditional policy of England, or to reason against stupid fear of the Russian bugbear. To the former objection the simple answer is that the policy of England has for a long time been a wrong policy, and that England has made up her mind to exchange it for a right policy. England will no more acknowledge, if it ever did acknowledge, the base doctrine of Lord Derby that we are never to interfere in any matter but where our interest demands it. The people, generous in its sentiments, even when it is mistaken as to facts, will never stoop to such teaching at this. The people approved the Russian war, because they were taught to believe that the Russian war was undertaken in a generous cause. We must repeat again for the thousandth time that the duty of England comes before her interest. We must, at any risk, undo the wrong that we have done. If to undo that wrong should bring the Russians to Constantinople, if it should weaken our empire in India, let the Russians come to Constantinople, let our empire in India be weakened. Lord Beaconsfield said that the fleet was sent to Besika Bay in pursuit of honour and glory. The kind of honour and glory of which he spoke may perhaps demand that the nations of south-eastern Europe be again pressed down under the yoke. But the people of England have had enough of that kind of honour and glory. They have learned that true honour and glory can be won only by doing right at all hazards.

As for the Russian hobgoblin, no friend of South-Eastern Europe wishes to see Constantinople Russian. All that we say is that, if we are driven to choose between Turk and Russian, we will take the

Russian. But we say this, not in the interest of England, but in the interest of South-Eastern Europe. We wish to see the now enslaved nations grow up for themselves, developing their own energies, striking out paths of freedom and progress for themselves. Therefore we do not wish to see them subjects of Russia. But, if this cannot be, if the only choice lies between a civilized and a barbarous despotism, between a despotism which at least secures to its subjects the common rights of human beings and a despotism which makes no attempt to secure them, we have no doubt as to which despotism we ought to choose. And we feel that, if things come to such a choice, the fault will not be ours, but the fault of those who have allowed Russia to take the championship of right out of the hands of England. Even if it could be shown that the interest of England lay on the side of the worse choice, we should still again say, Let the interest of England give way to her duty. But the notion that England has any interest in the matter is simply a worn-out superstition. I saw the other day an argument that it was not for the interest of England to allow any strong power to hold the Bosphoros. Here is the wicked old doctrine that the strength of one nation must be the weakness of another. The stronger the power that holds the Bosphoros the better, provided it be a native power. But if the folly and weakness of our diplomatists have decreed that it should be held, not by a native but by a Russian power, we shall lament the result, but we shall fail to see how the interest of England is involved. The only ground on which it has ever been pretended that our interest is touched in the matter, has been because it is said that the presence of Russia on the Bosphoros would block our path to India. But our path to India does not lie by the Bosphoros, but by Suez; and if Egypt could be transferred from its present merciless tyrant to the rule of England or of any other civilized power, it would be the greatest of boons for all the inhabitants, Mahometan and Christian, of that unhappy land.

When I am asked what is to be done, I say again what I said in December, with such changes as have been made needful by the events of the last nine months. Bosnia, Turkish Croatia, Herzegovina, Bulgaria, and Crete must be delivered from the immediate rule of the Sultan. This is the least that outraged Europe can accept. This is the commission which Lord Derby has received in the plainest terms from his employers and educators. And the word Bulgaria must not be limited to the land north of Hæmus, which alone bears that name in our maps. The Bulgarian folk and speech, the remains of the kingdom of Samuel, reach far to the south of the mountains, and a large part of the worst deeds of the Turk have been done south of the mountains. This is the *minimum*, the least which can be demanded in the name of outraged humanity. All those lands must be put in a position not worse than the position of Roumania now, not worse than the

position of Servia before the war. It is in no way hampering or embarrassing the Government, to quote a favourite party cry of the moment, to give them, in answer to Lord Derby's own request, these plain instructions. The exact boundaries of the new states to be formed, the exact form of government to be set up in each, the princes, if they are to have princes, who are to be chosen for each, these are points of detail which we leave to the assembled wisdom of Europe. We may criticize any definite proposal when it is made; it is not our business to make definite proposals beforehand. Let Turkish rule cease, and, though one change may be better than another, any change will be better than Turkish rule. As for Servia, no one will stop to discuss the insolent paper which was put forth by the baffled barbarian who tries to win by fraud what he has found that he cannot win by arms. The Turk has wrought his evil deeds in Servia, but he has not conquered Servia; the impudent demands which go on the assumption that he has conquered Servia must be thrust down his own barbarian throat. Let Servia be not worse off than she was before the war; let the revolted lands be not worse off than Servia; this is the programme of the people of England. Details they leave to those whose business it is to settle them; but their minds are made up as to the root of the matter. Less than I have just said they will not have.

Events do indeed pass quickly. Between the writing of the last paragraph and its revision, the insolence of the barbarian himself has been outshone. The lowest bellow in the Oxford mob could not depart farther from truth, farther from reason, farther from decency, than Lord Beaconsfield did in his notorious speech at Aylesbury. When the new Earl told the world that to speak the truth about Turkish "atrocities" was a greater "atrocit^y" than to do them, it was hard not to remember that there is but one living statesman of whom it has been said that he says the first thing that comes into his head, and takes his chance of its being true. When we go on and read the monstrous misstatements which Lord Beaconsfield was not ashamed to make with regard to the affairs of Servia, it is hard not to reflect on that curious rule of conventional good breeding by which to call such misstatements by their plain English name is deemed a greater offence than to make them. But the Psalmist's phrase of "them that speak leasing," Gulliver's phrase about saying "the thing that is not," may perhaps be allowed even in those serene regions where the new Earl tells us that he walks. And truly Lord Beaconsfield's babble about Servia—not "coffee-house babble," but babble doubtless over some stronger liquor—was, if any human utterance ever was, "the thing that is not." Lord Beaconsfield, by his own account, should have talked about barley; he perhaps meant, instead of talking about barley, to sow the wild oats of his new state of being. The one thing of importance

in this strange harangue is Lord Beaconsfield's distinct assertion that the revolted lands shall not be free. The people of England have distinctly said that they shall be free. Whose voice is to be followed? To which of the two will Lord Derby listen as his educator? To which of the two will he yield obedience as his employer?

After Lord Beaconsfield's display at Aylesbury all earlier displays, as we come back to them, seem tame. There is, for instance, the paltry cavil, the last straw at which the despairing advocates of evil clutch, the slander that the revolted lands are unworthy, incapable of freedom. Will they become more worthy, more capable, by remaining in bondage? In diplomatic circles it would seem that men learn the art of swimming without ever going into the water, that they learn the art of riding without ever mounting a horse. The lesson of freedom can be learned only in the practice of freedom. There may be risks, there may be difficulties; some men have been drowned in learning the art of swimming; still, that art cannot be learned on dry land. We appeal to reason; we appeal to experience; diplomatic cavillers shut their eyes to both. Go to Servia; go to Montenegro; see what free Servia, what freer Montenegro, has done, and be sure that free Bulgaria will do as much.

Last of all, the programme which I have just sketched, the programme which the people of England have accepted, the programme which Lord Beaconsfield scoffs at, is only a *minimum*. It is the least that can be taken; if more can be had, so much the better. Such a programme is in its own nature temporary; any programme must be temporary which endures the rule of the Turk in any corner of Europe. But such a programme is not temporary in the sense in which the makeshifts of diplomatists, the maintenance of the *status quo* and the like, are temporary. Restore the *status quo*, grant anything short of practical independence, and all that has been done, all that has been suffered, during the last year will have to be done and suffered over again. If we free the revolted lands, even if we leave the lands which are not revolted still in bondage, we leave nothing to be done over again; we only leave something in front of us still to be done. We make a vast step in advance; we enlarge the area of freedom, even if we do not wholly wipe out the area of bondage. To maintain, or rather to restore, the *status quo* is to make the greatest of all steps backwards; it is to enlarge the area of bondage at the expense of the area of freedom. The programme of the *status quo*, the programme of Lord Beaconsfield, points nowhere; the programme of the people of England points distinctly in front. We will have New Rome some day; if Mr. Grant Duff can give it us at once, so much the better. The conversion of Mr. Grant Duff—for a conversion it may surely be called—is one of the most remarkable phases of the whole business. Mr. Grant Duff has never been held to

be rash or sentimental; he has never been thought likely to say or do anything windy or gusty or frothy; to quote some of the epithets to which those who set facts, past and present, before the traditions of diplomatists have got pretty well seasoned. Only a few weeks ago, some of us were tempted to look on Mr. Grant Duff as almost as cold-blooded as Lord Derby himself. All is now changed. Mr. Grant Duff undertakes to lead us to the walls of Constantinople; and, where he undertakes to lead, no one can be called fool-hardy for following. There is no need even to dispute about such a detail as the particular ruler whom Mr. Grant Duff has chosen to place on the throne of the Leos and the Basils. Mr. Grant Duff has perhaps had better opportunities than most of us for judging of the Duke of Edinburgh's qualifications for government. At any rate we may be certain of one thing; his rule would be better than the rule of any Sultan. The examples of Servia and Montenegro, the example of Sweden—even the example of France—might, one would have thought, done something to get rid of the queer superstition that none can reign whose fathers have not reigned before them. A man who had had some practice in ruling, an experienced colonial governor for instance, might perhaps seem better fitted for the post than one who is a prince, and, as far as we know, only a prince. But here again it would be foolish to dispute about details. Any civilized ruler would be better than any barbarian. And Mr. Grant Duff's proposal for the employment of Indian officials is at all events wise and practical. Our platform then is simple. The more impetuous fervour of Mr. Gladstone leads us to a certain point, which is the least with which we can put up. The colder reason of Mr. Grant Duff leads us to a further point, to which we shall be delighted to follow him thither if we can, and, if he assures us that we can, no one can have any reason to doubt his assurance. Lord Derby then has his lesson; he has his commission. His teachers, his employers, have spoken their mind. The least we ask is the freedom of the revolted lands; but we take this only as a step to the day when the New Rome shall be cleansed from barbarian rule. There may be risks, there may be difficulties; but the Turk would hardly be so mad as to stand up against six great powers. Three such powers have in past times been enough to bring him to reason. If the trembling despot dares to dispute the will of his masters, he must again be taught a yet more vigorous form of the same lesson which was taught him when France cleansed Peloponnesus of the destroying Egyptian, when England, France, and Russia joined to crush the power of the Turk in the harbour of Pylos. The blinded ministers of that day could see in the good work nothing but an "untoward event." England now is wiser. Her people will have quite another name in their mouths, if the obstinacy of the barbarian should again draw upon him such another stroke of righteous vengeance.

EDWARD A. FREEMAN.

ENGLISH INFLUENCE IN JAPAN.¹

Who are the men who made the Japanese revolution, and who now maintain and defend its principles?

What are the chances of the popularity of the Japanese revolution continuing?

What, then, will be the duration of the present settled order of things; and, will English ideas continue for an indefinite period to gain ground in the country of the Rising Sun?

These are questions much oftener asked than answered, although the actual history of the Japanese Revolution is to be found recorded in a great number of books.

The first question—like many questions about Japan—can be more easily answered negatively than positively. The revolution was not made by any one man, nor by any very small group of men. The Emperor, formerly known as the Mikado, in whose name it was made, and by the influence of the authority of whose name its principles are still protected, had no share whatever in its conception or execution. That which was nominally a revolution of the Daimios, was in fact a revolution of their councillors. Each Daimio was assisted—or, rather, controlled, in the government of his feudal province by a small council chosen from among his retainers. The members of these councils were, as a rule, selected for ability by the council itself. They drew but little pay, and in their manner of life were not to be distinguished from the other retainers of the feudal prince. It is but little known that Daimios and their councillors alike hated the Tycoons. I will assume that my readers understand the position which had been held for five hundred years by these mayors of the palace, who supported the Mikado, in whose name they ruled, by a dole of twenty thousand pounds a year for the maintenance of the court at the ancient capital. The revolution had, of course, to be made in the Mikado's name; but it was not to be expected that a god-king, who had never been outside his palace, and who had never, according to many, set foot to earth even within his palace walls, would have the energy or develop the power to take a leading part in the revolutionary movement. During the revolution the Mikado, gifted as he is with a gentle and fair disposition, acted as he has acted since, namely by approving without hesitation, although with actual knowledge, of everything done in his name. His present position as Emperor was expressed to me by a Japanese gentleman in these words—"He never says 'No,' only

(1) An additional chapter for "Great Britain."

'Yes'—a sentence which would doubtless gratify the heart of Earl Russell. Made in this man's name, the revolution was carried through by the councillors of the Daimios, with the approval of their patrons. The Tycoon's government had never been popular with the Daimios. All Japanese history is a record of their partial rebellions. Since Commodore Perry's landing on the coast of Japan, the Tycoons had happened to be haughty men, who had given more than usual offence to the feudal princes, while the presence of the foreigner had caused the war exactions to press more heavily upon them, and at the same time had excited the agricultural population. All these facts told one way, and behind the Daimios were the ablest of their councillors, who saw in revolution not only a great career for themselves, but also a chance of a brilliant future for that country which almost every Japanese loves more than he loves life. The Satsuma and Choshu clans were the strongest that took part in the revolution; but that it was the councillors, and not the princes, who really led, is clear when we remember that the reigning prince of Satsuma was a child, and the reigning prince of Choshu a fool.

The revolution is sometimes said to have been directed against foreign influence. Foreign influence was a pretext. Some of the murders of foreigners by armed retainers of the feudal nobles were caused by a breach of Japanese etiquette by the victims, but most of the attacks are now known to have been made out of a fixed purpose of embroiling the Tycoon with his foreign friends. The revolutionary leaders knew, as well as the Tycoon knew, that the foreign influence was certain to endure; and on the other hand, in spite of the Queen's presents to the Tycoon, Sir Harry Parkes was more friendly to the revolution than he was to the government at the capital. Okubo, the present prime minister, and his leading colleagues were councillors of Daimios. Contrary to the prevailing English belief, there has been no change of government in Japan since the revolution, although there has been a certain shifting of persons. The men who made the armed revolution still direct that strange, peaceful, revolutionary government, which quietly rules Japan on revolutionary principles through despotic forms, and in the name of a heaven-descended Mikado encircled by a halo of all but actual divinity.

"But Iwakura," say some, who have heard or read a little of Japanese politics, "Iwakura, the foreign minister, who for a time was here, and Shimadzu Saburo, the great conservative chief—have not they held power, or rather fallen from it?" No. Iwakura was a courtier. A "courtier" in Japan meant one of the poetic, highly cultured, but un-energetic men, who surrounded the Mikado in his seclusion in the ancient capital. He was the ablest of the courtiers, and was valuable to the revolution through his station; but the

courtiers, so far as they have been used, have been the instruments of those able, pushing democrats, the former councillors of the feudal barons. What energy can be hoped for in men, however talented and however learned, who were the courtiers of a god-king, immured in that cathedral city of the East, the ancient capital, formerly Miako, and now Kiyoto—for even capitals change their names every few years in the revolutionary land of Japan? As for Shimadzu Saburo, on the other hand, he is the uncle of the young prince of Satsuma, who is at the head of the most powerful of the clans. That is to say, he is the foremost man among the Scotchmen of Japan. It happens that he is a Scotch Tory, while most of his clan are Radicals—still, he is the first man of that people who fill every office, military or civil, for which they have a candidate ready. There are not very many of them, but their numbers seem to be the only limit to the places which they hold. Shimadzu's brother, the late prince of Satsuma, who died, I think, just before the revolution, was a man so able that, had he lived, he would perhaps have changed the whole future of his country. Living as he did in pre-revolutionary days, he had to confine himself to manufacturing Bohemian glass, building steamboats without foreign aid, and setting up a telegraph line in his own county. But even as singular an event as the rule of an ex-Daimio may come to pass in Japan. Since his fall the ex-Tycoon—a very able man—has spent his time in shooting and sketching after the manner of his ancestors; but it is now beginning to be rumoured that it is far from improbable that the ex-Tycoon, who ten years ago was called by us the Emperor of Japan, may one of these days accept office in the revolutionary government carried on in the name of the Mikado. Shimadzu Saburo is so violent a Tory that he is exposed to much ridicule in Japan. In 1874 his time was taken up with writing a book called "Bemmo," an elaborate attack on Christianity, which has been translated into English, but of which I saw the Japanese edition, with cuts of all the Christian miracles. In 1875 he again turned his attention to politics. The edict against officials having their heads shaved had no fiercer opponent. He was a member of the council of state, and the day after the first intimation of the desire of the Government that officials should wear European dress appeared, he came down to the council with the hair of the sides of the scalp more firmly gummed up over the shaven part than ever, with one coolie to carry a mat for him to sit on among his colleagues (who of course were all seated in high velvet chairs,) another coolie to carry his pipe, and a third coolie to pull out over his feet the brocaded trousers, which trail behind a Japanese gentleman of the old school. He became in the course of the year exceedingly dissatisfied with the Government. While I was in Japan, in the

autumn, he made a great speech at the council in favour of war with the Corea, which he advocated chiefly for the purpose, he said, of giving employment to the late Samurai, or two-sworded followers of the Daimios. Of this dangerous class he is the accepted representative. When the Government decided to try and settle the Corean difficulty by peaceful means, Shimadzu resigned his membership of the council. Eight general officers in the army, all belonging to the Satsuma clan, resigned on the same night, and the Government expected a rising in the southern provinces. None took place, but it would not have been unwelcome to the men in power at the capital. They believe that the army can be trusted, and that any Conservative rising can be put down, while the opportunity would be taken to carry out some rather dangerous reforms. At the same time, as most of the superior officers in the army, from the commander-in-chief downwards, are Satsuma men, the confidence of the Government in the forces of the Mikado shows that Japanese patriotism must be stronger than any local feeling in the minds of the most distinguished of Shimadzu's fellow clansmen.

Such is the Radicalism of the Mikado's government, that any Englishman, whatever may be his politics, cannot fail to feel much sympathy with the Japanese Conservatives. The students trained in England and America must be personally offensive to them in the highest degree, and many of the acts of the Government which are, I am bound to say, regarded with indifference by the people, display a want of reverence for the past which can only be described as shameless. The selling for old metal of some of the most important monumental bronzes in the world, was nominally, in many cases, the act of the priests. In some cases it was undoubtedly the act of the Government itself, and the Government could at once have put a stop to the practice, had it chosen to do so. I have it, upon very high authority, that the Government proposed to sell Dai-Butz, a bronze and silver Buddha, sixty feet high, which is unequalled in Eastern religious art, and that this act of Vandalism was prevented only by the interference of some of the foreign ministers. I may add, that the "guardian figures" at the gates of the Temple at Kamakura, where the great Buddha stands, were destroyed by fire, and such has been the decline of religious sentiment among the people, that they could only be restored by a subscription among the European residents at Yokohama! The Japanese government are suspected of a strong wish to destroy the tombs of the Tycoons at Tokio (formerly Yeddo), where there is another magnificent relic of the past, the Loo Choo gates, bronze doors set up out of moneys paid as tribute by Loo Choo to Japan in the Middle Ages. All these monuments of which I have spoken are Buddhist, and Buddhism is the religion of two-thirds of the inhabitants of Japan; but it is not

the established creed, which is the mysterious pure Shintoo. The greatest temple in the capital was burnt down some years ago, and the incendiaries were hanged in 1875, while I was in Japan. They were Buddhist priests, and had destroyed their temple because it had been "purified" by order of the Government—i.e., converted into a Shintoo temple. The Government state that they have not confiscated Buddhist temples, but have only "purified" those which had been Shintoo, and which, under the influence of the Tycoons, had become Buddhist—for the Tycoons belonged to the faith of the majority, and not to the faith of the Mikado.

To show how radical is the Government of Japan, and how utterly disregarding of vested rights where public interests are at stake, I will refer to a matter in which a change is about to be made, which would hardly be approved, except under the pressure of desperate necessity, by western Radicals. The retainers, now strong and poor, while their ex-masters are weak and rich, are going to plunder them for the benefit of the fatherland. At the time when the revolution was made, the great sagacity of the leading men led them to patch up everything for a time. To the ex-Tycoon was given a province, which has since been taken from him. To the Daimios was given one-tenth of their former incomes, free of every kind of charge, so that Satsuma, for instance, who had had an army and a fleet to keep up, and a province to rule, out of eight hundred thousand pounds a year, has received eighty thousand pounds a year to play with, ever since the revolution. The retainers got nothing, except some posts, and those who were not sufficiently clever or instructed to become officers, civil or military, have had to earn their living by dragging miniature hansoms about the streets, and in some cases have begged their bread. Taxation now begins to press; the Government is poor in proportion to its wants, and the result is that, although they were only fixed six or seven years ago, the pensions of the Daimios are to be reduced. It is perfectly safe to take this step, and the European-trained Japanese regard with astonishment a stranger who asks any other question in relation to the proposed change. If you hint that it is not, perhaps, quite just, the answer at once is, "These persons do nothing whatever for the money they receive." At the same time, such is the astonishing strength of patriotism in Japan, that it is very possible that when the ex-Daimios are told that they must pay for the perfecting of the revolution, they will cheerfully and willingly submit.

An inspection of the Japanese "new Doomsday-Book" shows that some, at all events, of the Daimios are not "doing nothing" in all senses, for some of the names may be recognised as those of men who are working hard to enable themselves to take a place among those of their countrymen who are masters of the foreign learning.

The gentleman who, but for the revolution, would have been Prince of Awa, is an undergraduate at Oxford. His income is returned at £25,000 a year. The ex-Prince of Hizan, whose income is returned at £35,000 a year, is living in London with his family. His territorial title, and that of Satsuma, are not the only ones on the list which are dear to lovers of oriental ware. "Kanga," with his £90,000 a year, is suggestive of red and gold. There are about thirty ex-Daimios, who have, at present, incomes of over £20,000 a year a-piece, but all are now pensioners of the State. Their names appear in a pension list, and the total amount voted under the head of pensions is £2,800,000 a year. This is a large item in the accounts of Japan. The revenue and the expenditure of the country each stands at £9,000,000 and odd. The pensions are half as much again as the military expenditure, five times the cost of the navy, and five times the interest on the debt. The country is democratically organized, although under despotic forms. Money is wanted on all sides for the splendidly efficient services which have been set on foot. In army, navy, education, post-office, lighthouses, railroads, statistics, Japan wants to be on a level with the European world. Money must be found. On the other hand, trade is rather decreasing than increasing; tea and silk are the chief exports, and Japanese tea is peculiar, and does not easily find new markets, while the growth of the silk trade in Italy is doing serious damage to Japan. Under these circumstances, it is not strange that there should be an outcry for the reduction of the pensions. There would be such an outcry in all countries, but in Europe it would be without result. In Japan the reduction of the Daimios' pensions will probably take place. Okuma, the finance minister, is a clever man, but what can he do? Public opinion bids him fall upon the nobles. Their pensions, it must be observed, are already liable to taxation, and they have been reached by the heavy income tax, which took about a tenth of their incomes last year.

There is but one new commercial prospect that seems opening for Japan. The Government is at present engaged on a praiseworthy attempt to introduce sheep, with the view of converting the hills into pasture land. If this can ever be done, the population and the wealth of Japan may be enormously increased. The hills cover two-thirds of the country; the forests that once stood on them have all been cut, not a stick of timber has been planted, and no use whatever is made of the mountain tracts.

There are two points arising out of the matters I have just mentioned, in which Japan stands before the average of European powers; and one in which she stands at least before some—her finance accounts may be taken without suspicion. The services in which Japan stands so well are lighthouses and post-offices. I have

before me as I write the annual report of the Postmaster-General for 1875. The foreign post-office service was first introduced into Japan for trial on one road only in 1871. In four years Japan has beaten Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Turkey, and Greece. Three thousand five hundred post offices have been already opened, and the increase of letters posted is at the rate of fifty per cent. a year. As the Postmaster-General says in his report, "The enormous increase of fifty-six per cent. on the revenue of the preceding year is due . . . to the rapid progress of civilisation." He may well call the progress extraordinary, and the chief factor in producing the result has been the personal cleverness of the Japanese people. Let any one sit down with books alone to make a steam engine, and he will have some idea of the quickness to learn foreign arts which the Japanese display. The present minister for foreign affairs, as well as the late Prince of Satsuma, constructed engines in this manner. Every element of foreign civilisation has been introduced into Japan with the latest improvements which it has received. The Japanese, very properly, will have everything of the best, and their lighthouse system may be taken as an example. They already have thirty-three lighthouses at work, which are models to any country in the world.

All these services cost money, and there still may come a conservative reaction to the cry of "keeping down the rates." To hang the whole of the students who have been educated abroad, to restore their swords to the Samurai, and to strip the guards of their tunics and kesis, and give them back their armour of ten years ago, is a policy which may commend itself to Shimadzu Saburo, but is not within the bounds of possibility. The land-tax has increased, but the people are still on the whole contented, and their rulers are sufficiently clever to watch the signs of the times, and to be guided by public opinion. There are some Europeans living in Japan who hold the opposite view. Groaning under the somewhat ignorant Radicalism of the newly appointed local officials, they will tell you that the country has become a "prig's paradise," and that the reform movement will be at least checked, if not wholly suspended, by a return to power of the old feudal chiefs. They point out that in the powerful southern province, or as it might rather be called, the feudal and tributary kingdom of Satsuma, the Mikado's officers possess but little power, and they believe that the attitude of the Prince of Satsuma towards the Mikado may at any moment become that of the Dukes of Burgundy towards the Kings of France. The "Pakeha-Maories" of this part of the world, the English Japanese, who, having lived ten years at Yokohama, think that they can tell "modern Kiyoto" from "old Satsuma," will assure you that the reform movement fails to perform that which it has promised, and that it

cannot give efficient government because of the state of the finances. All that I can say upon the point is that everywhere in Japan the traveller sees all the outward signs of good government, the only exception—the state of the bridges—not being important in a country where there are hardly any horses, and hardly any heavy vehicles. When war with Corea was threatened in the autumn of last year, the *Nichi Nichi Shimbun*, one of the native newspapers of the capital, spoke of the Government as likely to go into a foreign war in order to stifle discontent at home, and called this “the fatal policy of Napoleon III.” The answer is that the Government did not go to war, but, on the contrary, successfully resisted the strong pressure which was put upon it by the war party: and those among the foreign ministers who know the country best believe that there is little reason to fear for the future of Japan.

My mention just now of the post-office reminds me of one of the grievances of the Japanese against this country, the existence of which is a slight bar to our influence becoming even greater than it is at present. Why should England refuse to follow the United States into a postal convention with Japan, and to accord her a position which we give to a backward country like Greece? Under so honest and careful a government as the Japanese, the retention of our separate post-office at Yokohama is a blunder almost fit to rank with the want of courtesy shown in connection with the monstrous claim of sporting rights in Japan set up by British subjects and backed by British power. I should go so far as to believe that extra-territoriality itself might with safety be given up in Japan. The Japanese would then allow foreigners to reside anywhere in the country, the splendid mines would then be worked with foreign capital and under foreign direction, to the benefit both of Japan and Great Britain. As I have named the mineral wealth of the country, in which lies her future chance of an extended trade, let me explain that there is scarcely a part of the empire which does not contain minerals. Coal is plentiful in the north; gold, copper, tin, lead, iron, iron sand, plumbago, antimony, copperas, cobalt, and sulphur are abundant; there is much marble, rock-salt, amber, fire-clay, porcelain-clay, petroleum, alum, rock-crystal, and some silver. With the exception of coal, these minerals are scattered all over the southern islands. Without going so far, however, as at present to give up extra-territoriality, there is much that could be done in the removal of small causes of irritation. Fuss, fidget, and bluster are not the best means of making friends with a young power, whose help in the North Pacific we may one day need. As an example of our less pleasant dealings with the Japanese, let me quote the heads of the shooting question. Englishmen, in the pursuit of their favourite amusement of shooting all over the country, have at times killed

poultry, and slightly wounded inhabitants. The Japanese Government, rightly careful of the lives and property of its subjects, not unnaturally objected, and proposed a system of shooting regulations combined with game laws, which was acknowledged to be reasonable. The Government offered to do the police work necessary for the enforcement of the game laws, to protect English sport, and they consented that offences under them should be heard by the foreign consular courts, but they asked that a table of fines should be agreed on before hand, so as to secure uniform treatment for all foreigners, and that these fines should go to the Government to recognise its right, and to compensate the informers. In the only other similar case of penalties inflicted on foreigners—namely, fines under customs regulations—the fines are specially fixed for all foreigners, and go to the Japanese Government. The Japanese only ask that this precedent should be followed. All the powers, except England, offered to concede the point, but Sir Harry Parkes expects that the Japanese shall find shooting for England and protect it by game laws, and that the paltry fines shall go to England, who is thus to benefit by the acts of her own criminals.

I named just now, as one reason for our trying to extend our already great influence in Japan, the possibility that a time will come when Japan might be a useful ally to us in the North Pacific. Such is the efficiency of the Japanese forces that a mere statement of their number should be accompanied with a reminder of their serious value. Their navy employs 4,214 men, all drilled under English instructors. All Japanese are liable to military service in the army, but the actual regular force—the whole of which would have been landed on the coast of China from seven to ten days after the declaration of war, had not war been prevented by the action of Sir T. F. Wade, two years ago—consists, on a war footing, of 49,930 men. On a peace footing, the army consists of 35,320 men, of whom 2,460 are artillery, 1,230 engineers, 440 military train, 720 garrison troops, and 30,080 infantry, including the imperial guard. There is only one regiment of cavalry. The effectiveness of the Japanese army is immensely increased by the fact that the great steam navigation company which owns some of the finest steamers in the world, is only the Japanese Government under another name, and the whole of the ships running to Shanghai are liable at a moment's notice to be used for the conveyance of troops. There can be little doubt that, had war broken out between China and Japan two years ago, the Japanese would have taken Peking; although, looking to the fact that the population of Japan is but little over 33,000,000, it is possible that Peking would have proved a Moscow.

There is one future suggested by the military statistics I have just

given, which would be even brighter than that of having Japan for our firm friend in the Pacific. Shall I be accused of dreaming dreams if I ask whether it would not be a happy thing that the Pacific should be neutralised? The states at present bordering upon that ocean, or wholly situated within its limits, have not yet followed those of Europe into reckless military expenditure. Japan is entering upon that course; and can we blame her when we remember the perpetual presence of a Russian squadron upon her coasts? Australia has no army, America desires no triumph of the sword, and Russia alone of all the Pacific powers is suspected of ambitious designs. Would it not be possible to induce the European Powers to agree to support the *status quo* in the Pacific, and to recommend the island Powers of that ocean to put down their armies, and apply their revenues to public works and purposes of trade, of art, and of civilisation?

I have answered, as well as I can, the questions with which I set out, but it is impossible to satisfy even one's self as to the accuracy of statements which concern so strange a country as Japan. What can be, or ever has been, in the history of the world, more singular than the combination of the extreme democracy of the spirit of its government with the blind tradition that is personified in the Mikado? I said above that the Mikado had taken but little part in public affairs. The marvellous fact is that, in so revolutionary a country, he should be there at all. His ancestors have reigned for 2,536 years at least, and his style, with magnificent simplicity, runs "Mutsuhito, by the grace of Heaven, Emperor of Japan, seated on a throne occupied by one dynasty from time immemorial."

I ought to explain what I mean by the phrase, "English influence in Japan." The diplomatic power of the English Government is perhaps greater than that of any other single foreign country at the court of Tokio, but it is not overwhelming; and were I thinking of it alone I should not speak of the English influence in Japan in the very strong terms that I have used. Japan plays off America against the European Powers, and by the spread of Russian dominion in Saghalien and towards the Corea, Japan is brought into close relations with a state the diplomacy of which has always been superior to that of England; and which is represented at Tokio by Mr. Struve, the once-dreaded secretary of the Government of Turkestan, who has never shown his great talent more clearly than in persuading the English community in Yokohama, and his colleagues at the capital, that garden parties are his only thought. Thus the English diplomatic influence, although the greatest, does not stand alone. In the organization of the services of Japan, the English do not take even the first place, for the French have the law and the army (though a change is being made), while the

English have to themselves only the navy and the mint; but the services are passing rapidly into the hands of the Japanese themselves.

The Japanese Government now employs only about a third as many Europeans altogether as were employed four years ago. The day is near at hand when a few French lawyers, acting as interpreters of the *Code Civil*, will be the only foreign servants in the pay of the Japanese. But it must not be supposed from these facts that the English influence will decrease when Englishmen have ceased to serve the Government of Japan. The external trade of Japan is, and seems likely to continue to be, in English hands. Yokohama and Hiogo are English towns. The Chinese are gaining ground in the treaty ports, but the Chinese influence in these days is the influence of England in another shape. In spite of the use of the Chinese character by the cultivated Japanese, the language of trade, as between the Chinese and Japanese in the treaty ports, is the English tongue. Many of the Chinese merchants are English subjects, coming as they do from Hong Kong. Moreover, and above all, the political influences of England and of America combine to lead the Japanese to the use of English as the official language. This policy is backed by all considerations of convenience in the case of an island power situated in the Pacific, the language of which is English, and trading but little with any country except America, England, the English Colonies and the thoroughly English treaty ports of China. The defeat of France by Germany, in the war of 1870, has operated in the same direction. The military, legal and financial prestige of French administration had caused the Japanese statesmen to copy the general governmental organization of France. Since the war Americans have stepped into many of the posts which Frenchmen used to fill, and the training of a few Japanese military students at Berlin has not affected the general result.

The rise of European influence in Japan has been accompanied by a patriotic revulsion against that which was formerly the chief foreign influence—namely, the Chinese. We may compare the patriotic rage against Germany, and the destruction of German influence which has accompanied the opening of Russia to western thought. Chinese influence was once as dominant in Japan as was German influence at St. Petersburg; but there is no reason to fear that the foreign influence of the present day will die out in Japan as the Chinese influence has died out. The Chinese civilisation was adopted by the Japanese because it was altogether superior to their own, and it was abandoned when found to be inferior to that of the western nations. Much has been written with regard to the rapidity with which the change has occurred, and it is indeed impossible not to forget that only fifteen years ago no European could set foot in

Japan except a Dutchman, and he only in one town. About ten years ago Japanese soldiers wore hideous iron masks, and carried bows, and foreign ministers could not traverse the streets of the capital itself without a strong guard. Now, although in the interior of the country you see no direct evidence of the foreign influence, you can, if provided with a passport, travel alone with perfect safety, and indeed receiving more courtesy from the people than is the case in any other country with which I am acquainted. In the towns, of course, direct foreign influence is noticeable at every turn. The officials are dressed in European dress, the police are European in appearance, the French light infantry bugle-marches are heard in the neighbourhood of all the barracks. From the French having drilled the army and the English the marines, the latter have all the British stolidity of their teachers, while the sentries of the guards at the gate of the Mikado's gardens strut up and down cuddling their rifles, or stand with their feet astraddle, in exactly the way in which, under the Empire, the Zouaves used to stand at the Tuileries gates. The bugles of the guards make day as horrible in the neighbourhood of the castle, as do the drums and fifes of the marines in the neighbourhood of the port.

English influence, of course, draws certain evils in its train. Birmingham metal work, cut-glass decanters, gingham umbrellas, and hideous boots and felt hats are spreading in the towns, and it has been my unfortunate fate to see an ex-Daimio dressed in a ready-made coat, driving a gig, and to behold the detestable suburban villa, near Tokio, in which another lives. At the same time, Japanese art has not yet been killed by English "taste." The show-rooms of the former palace of the Mikado at Kioto, even the tiger room in which the Mikado used to sleep, are surpassed by the marvellously lovely wall pictures of the rooms in the priest's house, at the temple on the Tokaido, near where the Enoshima path turns off, at Fujisawa. These are, I believe, but a few years old, and they certainly show no falling off from the work of the best period. There is one room of birds in a snow-storm, one of processions on a gold ground, one of egrets, and one—this last being the most beautiful—of flights of kittiwake gulls settling on or rising off the sea, while hundreds light and run along the sands. Many of the new screens in black, brown, and white, with no colour introduced except in the plumage of birds, much of the work in mixed metals applied to belts and other articles manufactured for the European market, the application of enamel to objects also produced for Europe, and such books as the new Nautical Almanac (in which even tables of logarithms are made artistic by the exquisite copper-plate engraving of the Japanese characters), on delicate mulberry-leaf paper, compare favourably with the productions of the best days of Japanese art.

Old Japan, as far as costume and social observances are concerned, may be compared with revolutionary Japan at the theatres, where are played interminable historic dramas, wholly based on the old state of things. Nothing has been changed in the Japanese theatre except, here and there, the hours; most of the theatres at the capital, and all those in the interior, play from 9 A.M. until dark. The theatres of the treaty ports now play from 5 P.M. to 1 A.M., so that at Tokio one is able to attend the theatre at most hours of the day and night. There the two-sworded Samurai still walk the stage, and Tycoon's soldiers still wear their hideous masks, and Daimios in magnificent trousers, preceded and followed by their banners and processions of retainers, still force the people to prostrate themselves in the dust.

In contrast to the conservatism of the theatres, the critical modern spirit is shown in the tea-houses which stand near them. There a common caricature sheet upon the walls, which dates from just before the revolution, represents a Daimio's procession of insects. The praying mantis, the locust, the grasshopper and the wasp are brought into requisition, given two swords a piece, and made to bear heraldic banners of cornflower, poppy and convolvulus. They imitate the swaggering walk and arms akimbo of the Samurai, and escort a feeble cricket carried in a cage. This is the Daimio, before whom a humble cockroach, who figures the people of Japan, reverently hammers his head upon the ground as he beholds him pass. Those Japanese who best knew their countrymen before the revolution, will tell you that there has always been a want of respect, other than enforced respect, among the people. Their attitude towards the Mikado seems to be the only exception to their general want of veneration, which is accompanied by a total absence of religious fanaticism, and, I think must be added, of religious reverence. The only temple in Japan inside which I ever saw a crowd, unless there was a wrestling performance going on within the walls, was that of Asaksa, in the capital. This temple is the centre of a sort of fair, or, as the whole of Tokio resembles the fair of St Cloud more than it does anything else in Europe, the centre of a fair within a fair—the wax-work show and big drum portion of the fair. The temple of Asaksa is entirely surrounded by peep-shows and shooting-galleries, and is always crowded, but more I think by sight-seeing country people out of curiosity, than by the people of the capital from religious motives. The Loo Choo envoys were there at the time of my visit—tall, bearded, solemn men, who seemed much struck by finding the place of honour in the temple occupied by a gigantic looking-glass. The mirror may properly find a place in either Buddhist or Shintoo temple. The doctrine of Pure Shintoo informs us that the Sun Goddess was enticed out of her dark cave by a looking-glass; but in Buddhism the looking-glass symbolises the mirror of the soul, and

the worshippers are supposed to repair to it as to a confessional. The young ladies with painted lips, and light blue or crimson satin obis, who eye themselves approvingly in the great mirror at Asaksa, perhaps think that it has other objects—at all events, there is nothing in the temple that “draws” so well. In a ghastly representation of the Buddhist hell, which is moved by clockwork and forms one of the most popular peep-shows outside the temple, the mirror also figures, and on it their crimes are shown to the dead as they enter hell. As I have named this show I may add that, if it was regarded seriously by the people, it would be evidence of the existence of a degrading superstition. It represents green devils with red tongues, and red devils with green tongues, pounding people in mortars, boiling them in oil and frying them upon gridirons. In one corner an assistant devil is engaged in tying the legs and arms of men together, and another, who stands by with a plumb-line and crayon, marks a black line down the middle of their backs for the guidance of a third, who saws them deliberately in half. As is seen, however, by the attitude of the spectators, the representation is regarded by the Japanese as a mere joke.

The religious indifference of the Japanese leads to singular results. I saw one day, in the commercial summary of a trade journal, this paragraph:—“Bronze.—The export of this metal has greatly increased, as, owing to the religious reforms of the Japanese Government, old idols and temple bells are being very largely sold.” The “old idols” of course mean Buddhas. The Government could never have acted as it has done, had the hearts of the people really been in their Buddhist faith. At the same time, I have a doubt as to whether the Japanese ruling classes, although they seek to establish Shintooism as the religion of the people, are themselves Shintooists any more than they are Buddhists. I have a strong impression that a fact remarked by me in the Mikado’s palace at Kiyoto, that the sole decoration of the grand hall of state consists of portraits of the Chinese philosophers, means that the Mikados themselves, spiritual heads of the Shintoo church—I had almost said divine heads—though they were, held Confucian tenets.

It is not only in religion that the Japanese show much pliancy. The questions at issue between the government of the Tycoon and that of the Mikado during the civil war were more than personal questions, and ran through religion, principles of government, and modes of thought, yet the leading men of the Tycoon’s government have been very generally employed by the government which succeeded to the imperial power.

One short story of the war will illustrate several statements that I have made.

In 1874 an American officer gave a dinner party in Japan. His

guests were a Mr. C——, a Southerner, Enomoto, now Japanese ambassador at St. Petersburg; and Kurota. Enomoto had commanded the last force of the Tycoon, eight years ago, and had afterwards been the chief man in the short-lived Japanese republic proclaimed at the northern island by the Tycoon's troops, after their master's fall. So sudden had been the change in a single year, that Enomoto had had under his command French officers who had entered the service of the then all-powerful "Emperor," and who almost immediately had found that they were serving in a rebel army. Enomoto had had under his orders the steam yacht *Emperor*, presented to the Tycoon by the Queen of England, and thus suddenly become a rebel ship. Kurota had been the general commanding the Mikado's forces at the siege of the last town which Enomoto held. In the last days of the siege Kurota had sent delicacies to the table of the rival general, and Enomoto had returned the compliment by sending a great work on military engineering to the general—as some say that he might be at no disadvantage in his siege operations, but, as others explain, in order that the very valuable work, of which there was no other copy, should not be lost to the common country in the fires which might attend the storm of the town. The dinner of 1874 took place at Hakodadi, which was the town in question.

Kurota, in the course of conversation, turning to Colonel W., said, "Why, only ten years ago you and Mr. C. were fighting against each other in Texas!"

Colonel W. at once replied, "Why, only six years ago you and Enomoto were fighting against each other at this very place!"

"Ah, yes," said Kurota, "but in Japan it's different."

Thorough as, to European ideas, has been the forgive-and-forget in America, it has been even more complete in Japan.

The courtesy in war, which is noticeable in the story I have just told, is characteristic of the Japanese. Those who would know that people should read the official narrative of the military expedition to Formosa in 1874. It is a romantic history, which cannot but awake a desire to make acquaintance with the dashing soldiers who bore so cheerfully the hardships of that rough campaign, and with the ministers—Soyesima, Okuma, and Okubo—who gained a diplomatic triumph over no less acute a master of statecraft than Prince Kung himself. If I had not known the utter fearlessness of the Japanese, I should have been tempted to believe, from the first part of the narrative, that they were afraid of entering on the active operations of the war. It was only their politeness. After landing twenty thousand men to avenge the cutting off the heads of some Japanese sailors, they sent embassy after embassy to the Formosan chiefs to get them to explain the exact reason why the men's heads

had been cut off, and it was only when the Formosans, growing impatient, cut off the heads of some of these envoys, that the Japanese proceeded to punish them by the destruction of their forts and towns.

Not only the proceedings of the Formosan, but those in the matter of the threatened Korean Expedition, are of interest, as revealing the real opinions of the Japanese upon foreign affairs. The leaders in the native newspapers, at the time when war with Korea seemed likely, give the most pleasing view of the enlightenment, and of the courage and spirit of the Japanese. The *Hochi Shimbun*, which opposed the war, wrote as follows:—

“Were we still in a state of barbarism all the money of the nation would be spent for war purposes. But in an advanced condition of civilisation the strength of the nation must depend on the progress of knowledge. If our statesmen were now to urge that increased provision for war should rank as of greater moment than the improvement of our judicial system, or the education of our people, they would exhaust the treasury and after all we should not be able to resist a power like that of England. What is necessary for our country is power in the people, which must come from the spread of that knowledge, which is really power, rather than from the making of provision against war.”

In another article the *Hochi Shimbun* said,—

“Some writers argue that the sending of an army against Korea is to gain renown for Japan abroad, and that even the enlightened countries of Europe extend their prestige by force of arms. But is it not a shallow notion of these critics to imagine that Japan will gain renown abroad from an expedition against Korea? If we insist on raising our prestige by arms, let us first of all chastise the encroachments of Russia. The truth, however, is that the prestige of Japan is not at present to be raised by arms. We are still unable to freely exercise our jurisdiction. On this account our Japanese brethren are constantly exposed to wrongs to which they ought not to be exposed, and foreigners escape punishment which they ought not to escape. We believe that the day which gives back to Japan her rights in these respects will be the day that will raise our national prestige.”

On the other hand the *Akebono Shimbun* wrote in the following terms:—

“Our army and navy are small, and the treasury is not full. But an independent country must, when forced to do so, protect its rights, and, if the worst comes to the worst, be prepared to fight even such countries as England and France.”

As I have said much in praise of the Japanese Government, I must, on the other hand, state that I am reminded by this mention of the native newspapers, that the new men who rule the country show a great impatience of the criticism of the Press. They have established an unwise and severe press-gagging law, and they have induced Sir Harry Parkes to issue an order of doubtful legality, making the publication of Japanese newspapers by British

subjects in treaty ports an offence punishable by imprisonment. This order confiscated a property already established, encouraged the Japanese in a foolish course, and made that a crime for Englishmen at Yokohama which is no crime for Englishmen at Shanghai and Canton. The authorities at Tokio would certainly like to reach Mr. Wirgman, the gifted correspondent of the *Illustrated London News*, who in his *Yokohama Punch*, published, fortunately for him, in English, represented, during my stay at Tokio, the Japanese home minister toasting editors upon a gridiron in presence of grim legions of spectacled Japanese police.

I cannot trust myself to write at length of what I saw in the interior, for I should, in the enthusiasm which seizes all who travel in Japan, be tempted to re-describe manners and scenes which have been described already. My most interesting trip was the last I made—one with a charming companion, a bank manager from Hiogo, to the feudal castle of Akashi. This was a trip not only full of pleasure, but full of interest, from its bearing on the changes which so suddenly have fallen on the country of the Rising Sun. Leaving Hiogo-Kobé by the Tokaido, or great high road of the Eastern Sea, of which I had already seen long stretches, between Osaka and Kiyoto, between Kiyoto and Lake Biwa, and nearer to the capital, the first spot of interest to which we came was an ancient battlefield, in scenery resembling that of Cannes. A grove of giant pine-trees stands on the sea shore, at the entrance to the inland sea by the lovely Akashi Straits. Here the northern and southern barons met in battle seven hundred years ago, and to this day the population of the neighbouring villages, wholly unrelated to the men who fell, pile little heaps of stones upon each grave. Passing the new fortifications of the Straits, and a fine ancient Buddha seated gravely in their rear, we soon came to our feudal town. The Tokaido separated the town proper from the houses of the Samurai, retainers of the family of Akashi. The houses looking towards the Samurai dwellings, and consequently towards the castle, had their windows screened with boards to prevent the prying of any Peeping Tom. The good old Tories who inhabit them have not been tempted even by the revolution to take down these inconvenient and ugly screens. The Samurai town is not unlike a strong Maori pah. From the outside, the houses cannot be seen. Each opening in a long mud wall is covered by another wall, from which defenders could fire upon an advancing foe. At the back of each house is a large garden in which rice could be grown during a blockade. Here once lived the swaggering swash-bucklers who, with arms akimbo and with two swords apiece stuck horizontally across their chests, used to march to Yeddo yearly with their lord when he went to the Tycoon's capital for his "enforced residence," and fight the retainers of the other princes in the streets.

Wide roads start from the Tokaido here and there as though to lead to Akashi Castle, but they lead but to a maze inside a hornet's nest; and conduct the stormers only to a loop-holed wall or to a moat. The real entrances to the castle are at the side and rear, and there four lines of fortifications lurk among the trees, with gates that are very Gibaltars of stone, while the keep surmounts a lofty rock. Behind the castle is a lovely park run wild, in which are glissanies with stems as large as one's thigh, growing from tree to tree, and lacing round the giant camelias and the tall bamboos. Tree-ducks fly from every old pine stem about the hawking-pond, across which flit kingfishers innumerable, their bright plumage showing even in the dense green shade. Near the fortress is a shrine containing a little Buddha; shrine and priest's house both deserted for five years, and the very mats, fine and valuable though they are, left upon the floors unstolen, as are the pictures on the walls. No Japanese are ever seen within the grounds: either they think them haunted, or their respect for the fallen Daimio is too great, for Japanese are not like other dwellers in picturesque places, unaware of the beauties that surround them. They love the picturesque; they are the only people who plant in their fields double fruit trees for the beauty of their bloom; and it is only their new government that has the vandalism to cut great trees. A fortified solitude is the best name for Akashi as it stands. Is the revolution popular in such a feudal town as this? It was the Mikado's birthday when I was there, and the national flag of the just-risen sun was hoisted upon every house. That this, however, was the result of a police decree, and not spontaneous, was clear from the fact that in the smaller villages of the neighbourhood, where there are no police, not a flag was up. The feudal princes spent, of course, much money in their chief towns. The ex-Daimio of Akashi, before whom eight years ago the people used to crawl; and who had power of life and death, is now living at Tokio in European style, while his retainers have been drafted into the foot guards.

In every journey in the interior it is of interest to note how far foreign influence is seen. Indirectly it is there, because the revolution was European, and the revolution is there. You no longer meet two-sworded warriors; you no longer see the people bowing to the earth before their princes;—that is all. Even the hats and boots and umbrellas of the treaty-ports have not yet appeared, and clogs or sandals, picturesque top-knots, and cotton head-rags, and pretty paper sunshades are still the order of the day. You sometimes see the telegraph; and in villages big enough to possess a book-shop you will find Japanese books on foreign countries in great abundance, with cuts of the Capitol at Washington, Wentworth-Wodehouse, the Tower of London, Chatsworth, George Washington, Louis Napoleon,

Madame Patti, and President Grant. The traveller finds evidence of a desire to learn English existing on all sides, and the Japanese already know more English than do our Indian subjects. Still, this wish to learn a foreign tongue is nothing new in Japan. Chinese has been worked at for ages in an aimless way. Chinese characters are used out of pedantry in books, although the easier Japanese characters have to be printed at the side. At a peep-show in the capital I found all the explanations, out of politeness, in the Chinese character alone, which few of the visitors understood. The intellectual and social debt of Japan to China is a subject of some interest in itself. Japan bears to China in civilisation the relation that Sweden bears to Germany. In the Middle Ages, Japan borrowed from China, as Sweden borrowed from Germany, many of the externals of her civilisation, but she kept, as Sweden kept, a national life alive beneath. To return to the language question, at all the temples receiving State aid are English and French inscriptions warning visitors not to fish in the ponds, and not to shoot birds in the trees, even where the temples are situated in parts of the interior seldom visited by foreigners, and never by any who cannot understand Japanese. The English of Japan is not at present very good. There are two guide-books to the ancient capital, Kiyoto, written in English by Japanese. The one calls Buddhas "idles," and the other calls them "idoles." Among the statements in these books are the following:—"It had been burnt to the ground by thunderlight twenty-nine years ago." "Biyodoin:—it was in this temple that a most brave general named Yorimasa suicided there 694 years ago." "Mumenomiya was built for honour of a virtuous person—at ancient, one thousand and twenty-six years ago." "Narabigaoka is named so because the hills stand very poticulairly after one another."

Whatever may be our doubts as to the extent of the foreign influence, we can have none as to the loveliness of Japan, and the delight of travelling in the interior. When I left the country I had seen seven out of the eight largest towns; but it is not the weeks in the cities that live in my recollection, but the few days spent in the country districts. Japan is the traveller's paradise. Through a strange medley of pines and palms, of rice and buckwheat, of bamboos and elms, of tea and cotton; through azalea thickets and camelia groves, across tobacco fields and past rocks covered with evergreen ferns of a hundred kinds, and crowned with grotesque remains; through tussac grass and forests of scarlet maple, and over mountains clad in rich greenery, you may journey in perfect peace, safe from robbery, safe from violence, safe even from beggars, never troubled, never asked for anything, except by a civil policeman for your passport, and that with the lowest of low bows. The maidens say "Ohio" sweetly to you in the villages as you pass, where eight years ago you

might have been sliced up by the sharp swords of the Samurai. "Ohio," too, call the labourers in the fields, leaving their work to come and bow at the roadside; not as the Javanese bow to the Dutch, but with the bow of equal to equal, the bow of infinite politeness. Without servant or interpreter, a European can travel in safety throughout the land.

The people and their houses have been described too often. One cannot but love their fun, their cleanliness, their inborn sense of art. It is impossible to realise that the Japanese are real men and women. What with the smallness of the people, their incessant laughing chatter, and their funny gestures, one feels one's self in elf-land. On a fine day, the men appear as grinning demons in black tights, streaked all over with blue heraldry. On wet days, the long rush coats and long-sided straw hats equally remove all vestige of humanity. When we turn over Japanese pictures in our English homes we fancy that both the faces and the dress must be unlike real life. On the contrary, they are very like the old fashions of the wealthy class, with whom faces are as much made up, and are as much a matter of fashion as are clothes. It is the country people of Japan who are my elves—the tiny, jovial, copper-coloured poor. Were I describing rural Japan at length, I would try to show that it may be looked at from a point of view from which it has not as yet been much considered. Japan is the last refuge of the Joyous Life. See the Thames on a fine Saturday in July, or the fair of St. Cloud on the last Sunday evening of its reign, and you may for a moment believe that even in Europe the Joyous Life is not extinct; but the fun of the Thames is vulgar, and the loose morals of St. Cloud are venal. The Joyous Life of the Middle Ages may have been bad or good—in Europe it is gone, and let us speak well of the dead—but it was neither venal nor vulgar; that life lives still in Japan, where no paganism of antique grandeur dwells, but rollicking, unthinking fun. All who love children must love the Japanese, the most gracious, the most courteous, and the most smiling of all peoples, whose rural districts form, with Through-the-Looking-Glass-Country and Wonderland, the three kingdoms of merry dreams.

CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE.

WILLIAM GODWIN.

ONE of Hazlitt's best essays reports a discussion as taking place at Lamb's supper-table, upon the men whom one would most like to have met. If the selection were to be confined to the literary constellations which have shone and been extinguished in England, there are few sets to which one would rather have had an admission than that of which Lamb was himself the centre. No sufficient Boswell has reported its wit combats, and we must reconstruct from our imaginations as best we may the superabundant pomp of Coleridge's monologues, and Wordsworth's sententious prosings, and Hazlitt's keen sarcasms, and Lamb's quaint by-play of humour relieved by outrageous puns. Of each of these, indeed, and of some lesser lights, we can form a tolerable picture from independent sources, but there is one figure who has always hitherto appeared under a veil.

It is hard to attribute any distinct personality to Godwin. Talfourd describes him as a man with the massive head of a giant set upon a low frame, and discoursing in a small voice, and with an almost finical manner, upon trivial topics. The presence of the most interesting companions could not prevent him from falling into a profound after-dinner sleep. Strangers who came to see the most daring of political speculators, and the author of what would now be called the most sensational of novels, were taken aback by this contrast to their preconceived notions. The bodily presence was mild, if not contemptible. They came out to see a prophet, and found but a reed shaken by the wind. Godwin's oddly divided career, indeed, might prepare us for some such peculiarities. Its end holds no proportion with its beginning. The man who began by publishing, in the heat of the French revolution, treatises which expressed the extreme form of revolutionary principles, eked out a livelihood in later years by publishing good little books for children, and ended life as yeoman usher of the Exchequer. It was a strange fate for the pupil of Rousseau, Helvétius, and Holbach and the rival of Condorcet, to owe his last gleam of comfort to the Duke of Wellington and Lord Melbourne. A similar contrast appears in his domestic relations. Godwin is probably remembered at the present day chiefly as the husband of Mary Wollstonecraft, and the father-in-law of Shelley. Their fiery natures influenced, but scarcely disturbed the placid tenor of his existence; and Godwin had to wear out near forty years after parting from the passionate affection of his wife, and near fourteen after losing his son-in-law, before he too made an exit almost

unnoticed by the noisy world. He had, one may say, outlived himself, and would have perhaps left a deeper impression if his days had been shortened by half. Had he died with his wife, we should have speculated on what he might have been. As it is, his later years cast a partial shadow of oblivion over his earlier activity.

Godwin left behind him voluminous papers; for he appears to have cherished the superstition, only too popular, which forbids the destruction of written documents. Some people seem to fear, rather superfluously, that the Dryasdusts of the future will not have work enough upon their hands. The correspondence and the journals have been used by Mr. Paul for the construction of a biography.¹ Mr. Paul has used them with great judgment, and has erred, if he has erred at all, upon the right side. Nearly all that he has published is interesting, though possibly the interest might have been increased by a little more use of independent materials. That defect, however, if it be a defect, can be supplied by the reader. We know, in general terms, what impression Godwin made upon his contemporaries; and now that we have a full selection from his letters, he ought to start out into stereoscopic distinctness of relief. And yet, it must be said that he still seems half to elude our notice. There are many interesting documents in these volumes: there are some admirable letters from Coleridge; a few characteristic notes from Lamb; and an account of Mary Wollstonecraft and her family which may serve as a complete portrait of one of the most interesting figures in the Godwin circle. It is enough to say here, that Mr. Paul has a warm admiration for this lady, and vindicates her triumphantly from the charge of having rebelled against established conventions simply because those conventions were trammels to vice. She was plainly a woman of much noble feeling and high aspirations: if her conduct was not irreproachable, and a vein of shrill declamation—too often associated with her favourite cause—mingles disagreeably with her eloquence, we must forgive much to a woman thrown from an early age upon her own resources; yet fighting the hard battle of life with high courage and generously helping her fellow-sufferers. And yet, I must confess that I am more attracted by Godwin's old Calvinistic mother, who sticks by her son for fifty years in spite of his freethinking, and writes queer letters from her country retirement, full of bad spelling, sound sense, scripture texts, praises of her favourite minister, and lists of market prices, the whole sometimes "enclosed in a goose." Her genuine human nature contrasts pleasantly with the philosophical sentimentalism of her son's circle. When Godwin recommends a hypochondriacal youth at Cambridge to study "Seneca the philosopher," and old Mrs. Godwin says of a good-

(1) William Godwin: his Friends and Contemporaries. By C. Kegan Paul. King and Co.

for-nothing son of hers, "Seneca's morals he bostes off is not sufficient," I somehow fancy that the old lady is most nearly in the right.

If the figures in the background persist in being more distinct than the principal character, the fault is not with Mr. Paul. He has done what can be done to bring his principal figure into relief: but Godwin, though we gradually gain some acquaintance with him, was wanting in the force and richness of character which keeps the dead alive. In many men diffidence is merely a veil, behind which lies the most genuine vigour; Godwin's diffidence lies at the root of his character. He was not merely shy in company, but shy when he was alone. The power was defective, as well as the disposition to exert his powers. Mr. Paul, who is not infected by the ordinary biographer's mania, says of him that, except in his one great love, "friendship stood to him in the place of passion, as morality was to him in the room of devotion." He was a man, in short, of tepid affections, who could be amiable, but not devoted. This, it may be said, is what we might expect from a man in whom, as Talfourd says, "the faculty of abstract reasoning so predominated over all others as practically to extinguish them. . . . He had no imagination, no fancy, no wit, no humour." He was, that is, philosophy incarnate. And yet this seems to be unjust on one side to philosophers, and on another to Godwin. The philosopher should not really be a man without passions, but a man in whom the calmer and more voluminous passions are developed at the expense of the narrow and violent. He should be deeply sympathetic to the great currents of human thought and feeling, though not easily disturbed by comparatively superficial perturbations. Nor does it seem fair to say of Godwin that he was entirely without imagination, when we remember that he was the author of a novel, almost unique in its kind; a novel which, if it is devoid of many more common charms, can never, as Hazlitt says, be begun without being finished, nor finished without stamping itself upon the memory of the reader. Godwin, we shall find on examination, has a distinctive, though not a highly-coloured character.

Godwin's life (1756—1836) divides with the century; or we may say that he lived in the eighteenth, and only survived in the nineteenth century. The first part of his history culminates with the marriage to Mary Wollstonecraft (1797); the second opens with his marriage to Mrs. Clairmont (1801). If the first marriage was the appropriate reward of a career of intellectual rebellion, the second tended materially to clip his wings, and confine him to the regions of the commonplace. In his earlier history Godwin represents a typical process in English political history. He began as a Dissenter to end as a full-blown radical in religion and politics. In his boyhood he was a Calvinist, with a leaning towards the special-Calvinism of Sandeman. The influence of the most eminent of the dissenters,

Priestley, led him to Socinianism. An acquaintance with writers of the French school developed his Socinianism to complete infidelity, if not to dogmatic atheism. When the French revolution broke out a year or two later, Godwin, who had long given up preaching for literature, was fully qualified to expound the political creed of which Priestley, Price, and Paine, all of them dissenters by birth, were the most conspicuous English advocates. The *Political Justice*, which appeared in 1793, is the most thoroughgoing English version of the gospel according to Rousseau, and indeed goes beyond his teachers. Caleb Williams, intended by its author to be an attack upon the existing social order, followed in the next year. When the English Government made its ill-advised attempt to suppress freethinking in politics by the prosecution of Horne Tooke, Hardy, and Thelwall, Godwin took an active part in defending them by his pen and by his personal appearance. Had the trial resulted differently, the author of *Political Justice* would certainly have been in a dangerous position. Godwin's reputation and character won favour in the eyes of Mary Wollstonecraft, herself already known by the *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. Even in his relations to his first wife, there appears something of Godwin's characteristic preference of reason to passion. He kept a separate establishment on principle, and in one of her last letters to him there is a complaint of the "icy philosophy" which had caused a momentary chill. But their love seems to have been strong and genuine. Godwin's description of their brief happiness is touching and manly. We feel that his philosophizing is for once but a thin veil over deep emotion. We pardon an affectation which is but the ostensible apology made by his heart to his intellect. Mary Godwin, however, died in giving birth to their only child, and the romance of Godwin's life disappears along with her.

His grief was for a time overwhelming, but within a few months we find him addressing another lady in love letters which Mr. Paul justifiably pronounces to be unique. He occupies many pages in arguing most lucidly against Miss Lee's religious prejudices. He shows to his own complete satisfaction that a Christian can have no logical ground for refusing to marry an infidel. He proves to demonstration that a lady should inquire into her lover's morals, but not into his creed. Miss Lee to his surprise refused to yield to demonstration. Next year we find Godwin employing his logic with equal fervour and equal want of success against a lady who thought that she ought not to accept him within a month of her husband's death. A year or two later Godwin had to learn that the weapon on which he prided himself was not more trustworthy in defensive than in offensive operations. One evening a lady exclaimed to him from her own window as he sat in his balcony, "Is it possible that I behold the immortal Godwin?" Godwin's logic was defence-

less against flattery, and within a few months he fell a victim to this enterprising widow, who became a "querulous though always admiring wife," but "a harsh and unsympathetic stepmother." Pecuniary troubles followed. Godwin had always lived by his pen. He had counted on the success of a tragedy, which failed ignominiously just before his marriage. To meet the expenses of his family he had to descend to mere bookmaking, and he failed to retrieve matters by becoming also a publisher. Difficulties thickened as the years went by, and Godwin became a greater proficient in the demoralising trade of respectable begging. It was, indeed, one of his theories that rich men ought to support poor men of genius, and he regarded subscriptions rather as proper tributes from his intellectual subjects than as implying a relation of dependence on his side. He took the money much as Comte in later years took the subscriptions of the faithful, but he had not, like Comte, any new revelations to promise. His later essays soften, if they do not retract, the opinions of his earlier writings, and were not of a kind to make much impression upon a world which had changed more rapidly than himself.

Begging, even on the loftiest principles, is not an elevating occupation; and there are some symptoms of deterioration in Godwin's character. He is rather querulous for a philosopher. That, indeed, is not very surprising. A moderate experience in the critic's trade will convince any one that nobody is so irritable as your thoroughly candid man. He is so plainly in the right that one who finds fault with him must be monstrously unreasonable. Godwin was therefore sensitive to criticism from early years; and it is no wonder if, in later life, with an uneasy family, and under continual difficulties, he should have become peevish and fretful. The habit of covering his irritability under a cloak of candour comes out oddly in many of Godwin's letters. After describing Hayley very unfavourably in one of them, he adds, "Damn him. I say this in the sobriety of my judgment, and without a spice of resentment."¹ Godwin damns a good many people pretty heartily on these terms. He quarrelled more or less persistently with most of his friends—with Mackintosh, Parr, Holcroft, and even for a time with Lamb. His unreasonable love of reasoning must have been as amusing in his literary relations as in his love affairs. Some letters which passed between him and Kemble, on the occasion of his unfortunate theatrical ventures, exhibit him as one of that inconvenient race—the authors who invite criticism, but think that criticism, if hinted, is an impertinence, and, if detailed, an insult. A very curious bit of self-analysis² shows that he was even morbidly alive to the faults of character in which these weaknesses were rooted. He describes

(1) Vol. ii., p. 189.

(2) Vol. i., p. 358.

even too strongly his strange diffidence, his want of tact and sympathy, his coldness of temperament, and the awkward contrast between his daring as a thinker and his weakness in active life. The confession explains sufficiently the difficulty of personal dealings with a man whose emotions were so oddly masked by his reason or concealed under diffidence. And yet he was fundamentally amiable, as appears most prominently in his relations to women and youths. In early life he asked his sister to choose a wife for him, and discussed the lady whom she suggested with the deliberation of a diplomatist of the old school. I have already noticed the queer mixture of passion and argument, or rather the substitution of argument for passion, in his later love-letters; yet we are told that when his first marriage was announced two ladies shed tears. The singular letters written by one of these ladies, Mrs. Inchbald, seem to imply that her love was changed by the disappointment into something very like spite. Even on the occasion of Godwin's great loss, she replies to his appeal for sympathy by insulting remarks about the woman he had lost, and proposes to break off their acquaintance for ever. He sent her his play a year or two later, and she congratulated him on attaining a place "among the honoured few who, during the last century, have entirely failed in writing for the stage."¹ A partial reconciliation seems to have taken place afterwards; but Mrs. Inchbald's persistent bitterness is perhaps as strong a proof as others of a less disagreeable kind, that Godwin could be very charming to some women. Perhaps they recognised the general kindness and loftiness of feeling which lay beneath his external foibles; female society might thaw his habitual diffidence. Perhaps, too, it is true that women generally like priggishness and conceit.

Another peculiarity of Godwin's is more conspicuous. One marked peculiarity of his whole life was the influence which he exerted over young men. Shelley is only one, though by far the most celebrated, of the ingenuous admirers who found in him a temperate and kindly adviser, and believed in him with the hero-worship of youth. The influence was perhaps owing in part to Godwin's amazing confidence in the power of reasoning. When we have grown up, we begin to resent argument. We have made up our minds and don't want to be assailed by a battery of syllogisms directed against our most cherished principles. But a young man is naturally sensitive to the implied compliment, when a reputed philosopher deals with him as a reasonable being. Godwin really acts up to his principles and tries to convince his young friends, instead of overawing them by authority. When Shelley, still a lad without fame, went off to Ireland and proposed to reform mankind out of hand, most men would have set

(1) Vol. ii., p. 77.

him down as a crackbrained enthusiast. Godwin reasons with him gravely and sensibly. "You say," he writes, "what has been done within the last twenty years? O that I could place you upon the pinnacle of ages from which these twenty years would shrink to an invisible point! It is not after this fashion that moral causes work in the eye of him who looks profoundly through the vast and—allow me to add—venerable machine of human society." Such advice might come with a good grace from one of the few men who had never justified the revolutionary violence with which his principles were associated, nor been frightened by the violence into disavowing the principles. He might fairly represent to the youthful imagination the ideal philosopher, fixed in his opinions, mild in applying them, and anxious to conquer by the fairest of weapons.

Moreover, all Godwin's writings are really marked by elevation of tone and generosity of feeling. When he blunders, he blunders in great measure from taking too high an estimate of the fundamental goodness and intelligence of the species. His doctrine is lofty in substance, and is to be propagated by worthy means. Coleridge, a thinker of a very different school, speaks of him in 1811 (in a letter, it is true, addressed to Godwin himself) as "the philosopher who gave us the first system in England that ever dared reveal in full that most important of all important truths, that morality might be built up on its own foundation, like a castle built from the rock and on the rock, with religion for the ornaments and completion of its roof and upper stories." The morality thus founded on pure reason was to win adherents by reason alone. When Godwin's personal merits came in question, his literary vanity was easily aroused and the philosopher became irritable. But in speculative discussions he is true to his principles. His belief in the power of reason is genuine to the last. No rationalist is freer from a too common inconsistency. Reason is so plainly on his side that he asks for nothing but fair play for his arguments, instead of asking, as too many of us ask, that his opponents should be treated as incapable of argument. He pushes his hatred of tyranny into an extravagant hatred of all government; but his hatred is steady, consistent, and uncompromising, though never flaming into passion. The calmness of his temperament enables him to cultivate that rarest of all virtues, a tolerance not founded upon indifference. Such philosophy might well impose upon a generous and imaginative youth; and Queen Mab and the Revolt of Islam may best be described as Godwinism sublimated into poetry. To many people, perhaps, it is hardly made more readable by the change; for I suspect that most readers are soon wearied by Shelley's phantasmagoric unrealities. His fame, however, though founded on infinitely better claims than his reproduction of Godwinism, may reflect some interest upon the Political Justice.

Godwin's treatise in its general design reminds us rather of French than of English models. He is what so few Englishmen are—a thorough-going “ergotist.” His treatise embodies what is called inexorable logic. In other words it represents the really illogical frame of mind which refuses to be shocked by a *reductio ad absurdum*. One principle is ridden to death. That principle is the supremacy and all-sufficiency of reason. As a true prophet of the era, Godwin makes a clean sweep of all tradition. He rejects all that implicit reason which has embodied the past experience of the race in dumb, instinctive prejudices, without becoming articulate in logical demonstrations. So far his affinities are distinctly French, and, like Tom Paine, he represents the English reaction of the French movement. But it is plain that he has sat at the feet of other teachers. He ranks Hume with “the most illustrious and venerable of men”¹ for his logical profoundness; and it is chiefly from Hume that he borrows his philosophical armoury. The influence of the great sceptic is evident throughout the book. Following Hume, he rejects the social contract and the *a priori* doctrine of the rights of man, popular with the school of Rousseau. He borrows Hume's arguments against freewill, though perhaps not thoroughly understanding them, and accepts Hume's utilitarianism and his admission of the unselfish impulses. Godwin's philosophy, in short, is derived from Berkeley and Hume; his sentiment from the revolutionary doctrines then triumphant in France; but he gives a turn of his own to the adopted materials. The main outlines of his curious system may be briefly indicated.

All the revolutionary theories, and Godwin's among them, start from the assumption of human equality. Man, in their dialects, means the colourless unit which remains when abstraction has been made of all the peculiarities of race, government, and religion that cause one man to differ from another. This metaphysical entity, admirably fitted to be the subject-matter of beautiful mathematical demonstrations, is then identified with the concrete animal; and it is assumed that because man, stripped of all specific qualities, must be everywhere the same, therefore men, as clothed with all those qualities, must be the same. Thus all appeals to history and experience may be summarily set aside as irrelevant, because referring to the accidents instead of the essence. But how are we to determine the qualities of human nature in the abstract? for some primitive quality must be left to afford a point of adhesion for our logic. Godwin's answer is again modelled upon Hume. Man is not only devoid of innate ideas, but almost, it would seem, of innate capacities. The mind, if there be a mind, is nothing but a series of thoughts and sensations, which may or may not inhere in some hypothetical substratum.² Hence the person is entirely built

(1) “Political Justice,” vol. ii. p. 491. (Third edition.)

(2) *Ib.*, i. 25.

up of the various ideas which have somehow cohered in what may or may not be a mind. We begin life without innate principles or instincts, and though some differences of animal structure must be admitted, they are comparatively trifling. "It is the impression that makes the man, and compared with the empire of impression the mere differences of animal structure are inexpressibly unimportant and powerless."¹ Large brains are made by many thoughts, not thoughts by the brain. It is needless to ask whether this doctrine be legitimately derived from Hume, or should not lead to a self-destructive scepticism. Godwin infers from it the indefinite modifiability of every human being. The embryo man is so nearly a zero that everything which makes the complete adult is due to the accumulation of ideas poured in since his birth. When the process takes place legitimately it is called reason. When illegitimately, we have the various forms of error which produce vice in morality, tyranny in politics, and inequality in society. We must naturally conquer error. The will is entirely determined by opinion, if the will be anything but opinion; and therefore truth is omnipotent. You have nothing to do but to exhibit to a man adequately the reasons for right conduct, and he will inevitably adopt it. The passions, even those which have been regarded as strongest, may be easily conquered, if only their nature is clearly exhibited. Man, therefore, is "perfectible, or, in other words, susceptible of perpetual improvement."²

The morality founded upon this doctrine is utilitarian; but not in the ordinary sense. The weak side of the old utilitarianism was the necessary imperfection of its appeal to experience. In framing a calculus of human happiness it started from the individual, instead of the social, point of view. It tried, that is, to reckon the consequences of an action, without taking into account the history of the social organism which can alone explain its moral development. Godwin shares this weakness. But most utilitarians started also with the first principle that a man's own happiness could be the only end of his actions. Their doctrine was, therefore, identified with the doctrine of pure selfishness, whether backed or not by some reference to supernatural sanctions. The opposite school, which sought to discover the moral law in pure reason, endeavoured to dispense with any empirical test. Morality must have no reference to happiness, to save it from degenerating into mere prudence. Godwin borrows from both sides. He is an intellectual utilitarian. Morality, as he reiterates, is nothing but a calculation of consequences. It is a kind of moral arithmetic.³ That action is best which produces the greatest sum of happiness. Vice is a wrong calculation, and virtue a right calculation of consequences. Everard Digby thought it his duty to blow up King James and his parliament.⁴ His motives

(1) *Ib.*, i. 40.(2) *Ib.*, i. 86.(3) *Ib.*, i. 173.(4) *Ib.*, i. 157.

might include the most admirable philanthropy; but the action was wrong, because a right calculation would have shown him to be mistaken in the estimate of its consequences. Moreover, in calculating consequences, we are bound to pay no more regard to our personal interests than to those of any one else. If I had to choose between saving the life of Fénelon, when employed upon his "immortal Telemachus," and saving the life of his valet, I should clearly have done most good by saving Fénelon; that is, I ought to have saved him. If I had been the valet, I ought, by the very same showing, to have preferred my master's life to my own. Further, if the valet had been my brother, my father, or my benefactor, the case would not have been altered.¹ "Gratitude, therefore," so far as it implies personal considerations, "is no part either of justice or virtue." The fact that a man is my father does not make his happiness intrinsically more valuable. It should not therefore influence my conduct as a reasonable being. This part of Godwin's theory startled his contemporaries, and was abandoned at a later period by himself. Yet it is but the logical corollary from his principles, and Godwin scarcely saw that to abandon it was to make an admission fatal to his system.

Thus interpreted, utilitarianism seems to be fairly obnoxious to one of the alternative accusations generally levelled against it. It does not sanction selfishness, but it prescribes an impossible standard of heroism. I am to act as an angelic spectator,² freed from all the ties and prejudices of my condition and animated only by an impartial desire for the happiness of all men, would wish me to act. Every man "is bound to consider himself a debtor in all his faculties, his opportunities, and his industry to the general welfare. This is a debt which must always be paying, never discharged." The least deviation from the path which leads to the greatest happiness of the species is a crime. Every man "should feel himself obliged to scruple" (qy. not to scruple?) "the laying out his entire strength and forfeiting his life upon any single instance of public exertion." This is in fact the creditor and debtor theory of Calvinism, translated into philosophy. When we have done all, we are unprofitable servants.

Man, then, is not merely a reasonable being, but is, so to speak, created by reason. He is hardly even the sheet of white paper, on which experience is to write its arguments. His very tissue is itself woven out of argument. Since good arguments naturally prevail over bad ones, man, could a hearing for the truth be secured, might be actually constructed of right reason. Reason should be the sole judge of truth; the sufficient sanction of morality; the sole agent in regenerating society. For somehow things have gone terribly wrong, and though man as he might be has indefinite capacities for

(1) *Ib.*, i. 129.

(2) *Ib.*, i. 133.

wisdom and virtue, man as he is has been most accurately painted by Swift.¹ He is a Yahoo, and is to be made into an angel. It has come to pass, as a matter of fact, that society is bound together by instincts, rather than by reasoned convictions. A modern utilitarian might appeal to experience as showing the paramount importance of those instincts. But with Godwin, who reasons from the nature of man considered as a colourless unit, provided only with a capacity for reason and for happiness, such an appeal is impossible. An instinct is not reason, and therefore must lead to superstition instead of science. Loyalty implies obedience not founded on reason, and such obedience is but another name for slavery. A man who has resigned his reason into the hands of another may be indefinitely misled. Reason, which starts from assuming the equality of mankind, must condemn monarchy and aristocracy, which imply some natural inequality. Therefore, as Godwin says, "it must be laid down as a first principle that monarchy is an imposture."² But this is a trifle. "Government is nothing but regulated force;"³ but force is not argument, therefore all government is wrong. "That any man or body of men should impose their sense upon persons of a different opinion, is, absolutely speaking, wrong, and in all cases deeply to be regretted;" though in some cases the evil, essential to government, must be endured.⁴ The cases, however, on Godwin's showing, would be few. Association of any kind is bad, for even voluntary associations tend to suppress the free play of individual sentiment.⁵

This simple logic makes a clean sweep of all political institutions. In an ideal country the constitution would consist of two articles; the first dividing it into equal electoral districts; the second prescribing means of electing a national assembly, "not to say that the latter of these articles may very probably be dispensed with."⁶ Hence, he thinks, would speedily follow the breaking up of the empire into a confederacy of small republics, and another "sufficiently memorable" consequence—"the gradual extinction of law." Even criminal law, as he argues at length, is a blunder. The gallows is most illogical. It appeals to fear instead of reason. "What would not man have been long before this, if the proudest of us had no hopes but in argument?"⁷ When a man has a knife at our throats there is some excuse for coercion. Yet even here there are doubts. "The powers of reason and truth are yet unfathomed." Marius repelled the assassin by the grandeur of his appeal. Why should not we? "It would be well for the human race if they were all in this respect like Marius, all accustomed to place an intrepid confidence in the single energy of

(1) Godwin frequently refers to Swift as a great political teacher. See e.g. ii. 209.

(2) *Ib.*, ii. 48. (3) *Ib.*, i. 230. (4) *Ib.*, i. 258. (5) *Ib.* Book iv. chap. iii.

(6) *Ib.*, ii. 292.

(7) *Ib.*, ii. p. 334.

intellect.”¹ But we don’t punish a man till his violence is over. That is more illogical still. To punish with a view to future restraint is “abhorrent to reason.” To punish for reformation is absurd, for reason has nothing in common with coercion. “Reason is omnipotent; if my conduct be wrong, a very simple statement, flowing from a clear and comprehensive view, will make it appear to be such; nor is it probable that there is any perverseness that would persist in vice, in the face of all the recommendations with which virtue might be invested, and all the beauty in which it might be displayed.”²

The good simple Godwin! After this it is a trifle to observe that he abolishes monarchy, aristocracy, churches, armies, laws, associations, inequality of property, and marriage. All promises are, in some degree, evil; for to promise is to limit in some degree the future exercise of my reason.³ The unalterable promise made in marriage is specially objectionable; and Godwin observes with his usual calmness that “the abolition of the present system of marriage appears to involve no evil.”⁴ It is, he says, an important question whether in a reasonable state of society, the rule would be promiscuous intercourse, or an adherence of particular pairs, so long as they mutually agreed. He thinks the latter alternative the most probable, because “it is the nature of the human mind to persist for a certain length of time in its opinion or choice.”⁵ Thus society is finally pulverized and reduced to a mere agglomeration of independent atoms combining and separating according to chance or the dictates of pure reason. This result itself is happily to be brought about, not by violence, but by the diffusion of sound reason. Modern worshippers of Individualism may seem to be feeble plagiarists from Godwin.

The result of applying Godwin’s principles is of course to be the advent of the millennium. Everybody is to be good and happy. The labours of every man for half-an-hour a day will supply the wants of all men.⁶ The abolition of law will lead to the disappearance of crime. If man does not become, strictly speaking, immortal, his life may be prolonged beyond any assignable limits,⁷ and we shall realise the vision of Franklin, who expected that one day mind would “become omnipotent over matter.”⁸ Another consequence would follow which excited particular attention. According to Godwin, the population was kept down because some people acquired more than their fair share of wealth. “The established administration of property,” as he put it, “may be considered as strangling a considerable proportion of our children in their cradles.”⁹ Wallace had suggested in a rather paradoxical pamphlet (1761), that a community of property, otherwise desirable, would lead to an intolerable

(1) *Ib.*, ii. 338. (2) *Ib.*, ii. 341. (3) *Ib.*, i. 196. (4) *Ib.*, ii. 508. (5) *Ib.*, ii. 509.
(6) *Ib.*, ii. 484. (7) *Ib.*, ii. 527. (8) *Ib.*, ii. 503. (9) *Ib.*, ii. 467.

multiplication of our numbers. Godwin replied that the fear was altogether premature. Three-fourths of the earth are uncultivated, and the cultivation is at present very imperfect. "Myriads of centuries of increasing population may pass away, and the world be yet found sufficient for the support of its inhabitants."¹ The anticipated evil may be left to the consideration of our wise, virtuous, and immortal descendants, who will perhaps by that time be omnipotent over matter.

Mr. Paul speaks of Godwin as in some sense the originator of "philosophic radicalism." The school, however, which was more specifically known by that name, has a different genealogy, and was bitterly opposed to Godwin upon this very issue. Bentham (Godwin's senior by some years), and his disciple, James Mill, were the leaders of that school of thought; and to them Godwin's whole method was utterly abhorrent. The question was first brought to the surface by the essay of Malthus. After the true English fashion, Malthus met his semi-Gallican antagonist, not by opposing to him a different generalisation, but by fixing upon a particular point. The force of Malthus's reasoning has gained for him an established position in political economy; and his theory is recognised as a particular case of Mr. Darwin's struggle for existence. Godwin's full reply to Malthus was delayed till 1820. It failed, says Mr. Paul, to excite much attention, because the interest in Malthus had already died out. That is doubtless true in part; controversy had ceased; but it is also true that Godwin's treatise is the weakest and most ill-tempered of all his philosophical writings. He seems to be quite incapable of understanding his antagonist's position, and sometimes argues for him when he fancies that he is arguing against him. Godwin's ideas seem to have ossified in some respects, and he attacks Malthus with a complete want of discrimination. One characteristic, however, is curious. There is an apparent inversion of positions. The opponent of all government thinks that the ancient Peruvians must have been a prosperous people, *because* all their wealth was divided into three equal parts, of which one went to the priests, and one to a paternal government.² The so-called atheist attacks the Christian—Cobbett's "Parson Malthus"—on the principles of the gospel. "Nature," he tells us, "takes more care of her works than such irreverent authors as Mr. Malthus are apt to suppose."³ And the retort, whether consistent or not, was in this case tolerably relevant.

It must be remembered, in fact, that in Malthus's first edition the moral cheek was omitted, and even in later editions was pronounced to have been historically of little importance. The argument, therefore, whatever its true import, might naturally appear to Godwin and his supporters to be equivalent to the assertion that vice and misery were providentially ordained features in human

(1) *Ib.*, ii. 518.

(2) "On Population," p. 62.

(3) *Ib.*, 219.

society. Malthus, in his later form, argues with irresistible force that want of prudence must generate vice and misery. In his first shape he seemed to deny that, as a matter of fact, men were governed by prudence at all. So far from being the reasoning beings of Godwin's fancy, they were under the absolute dominion of a blind impulse. They multiplied as the beasts multiply, and were restrained, as the beasts are restrained, by famine, or its fore-runners. Malthus, in fact, starts with the explicit assertion of the principle made familiar by Mr. Darwin's use of it and already stated by Franklin. If it were not for the competition of other species, said Franklin, the earth might be entirely overspread with fennel; and, on the same principle, by the descendants of a single nation. When men are brought under the same rules as other animals, the implicit statement seems to be that men are brutes. Malthusianism is thus the converse of Godwinism. Godwin asserts the potential supremacy of reason; Malthus its actual nullity. And Malthus, in an excellent letter addressed to Godwin in these volumes,¹ indicates the application of his theories to Godwin's whole doctrine. The inequality of wealth, against which Godwin protests, is necessary, according to Malthus, in order to stimulate prudence. The competition of political economists is the struggle for existence of naturalists. It is a necessary form of progress so long as men partake of the animal nature, and are tempted to gratify their passions in defiance of reason. The strongest and wisest find in it a sufficient motive for energy, and are enabled to hold their heads above the mere scramble for a livelihood of the less civilised masses. The controversy between Godwin and Malthus is thus the indication of a deeper discord. It is the first action in the long warfare between the political economists and the various prophets of Utopia; between those who, appealing to facts as they are, are tempted to regard the present order as final; and those who, looking forward to a reign of justice and happiness, are tempted to fancy that it may be summarily introduced in defiance of existing facts. Malthus had clearly the best of the argument on the particular issue selected: but the world cannot afford to dispense with the dreamers, who, if their speculations be futile, help at least to keep alive the enthusiasm of humanity. That was the service which Godwin rendered in his generation; and the singular futility of his proposed abolition of all social bonds should not blind us to the generous sentiment which underlies them.

Godwin's later essays, the *Enquirer* (1797) and the *Thoughts on Man* (not published till 1830, though written at an earlier period), qualify his views materially. It is one of his doctrines that a man should always be ready to revise his opinions, for how else can he be devoted to reason? and he availed himself liberally of the

(1) *Life*, i. 321. •

privilege. In 1798 he notes in a private memorandum¹ that he wishes to modify the Political Justice. He has not yielded "a proper attention to the empire of feeling," nor, by consequence, to the value of private relations; and he wishes to admit that men have most important differences at their birth. A happy marriage, the best of all educations, had doubtless brought him truer views of the value of domestic affections; but these concessions, fairly worked out, would have cut very deeply into his whole political system. Unluckily he had never time or inclination to reconstruct his theories. Both volumes, however, contain much interesting writing. They have Godwin's characteristic merits. The style is rather too smooth, and Godwin is given to terribly trite classical illustrations after the old-fashioned model; but the style, if over smooth, is lucid, and the appropriate exponent of a mind always calm, candid, and in earnest. He argues fairly and thoughtfully; and even when he indulges in commonplaces, as, to say the truth, he indulges pretty freely, his evident conviction of their importance redeems them from contempt. The most pleasing part, to my taste at least, is that which deals with education. Godwin's sympathy with youth is always amiable, and in education we are still most in need of his favourite doctrine. The old brutal theories, which treat the infant mind as a mere receptacle into which ideas are to be crammed by main stress of birch and discipline, whether it be or be not capable of assimilating them, is not so rampant now as then; but it has left behind it some awkward legacies in various forms of scholastic pedantry. Godwin urges very forcibly that the teacher should aim at stimulating the desire for knowledge instead of injecting knowledge ready made; and should try to turn out youths of five-and-twenty with teachable minds, not with minds ready to teach the universe.² A hint or two of this kind might be useful at our universities. It can hardly be said, however, that Godwin's essays have much permanent literary value. They have almost as little of Hazlitt's vigour as of Lamb's humour. An anecdote related by Hazlitt may illustrate the degree in which Godwin possessed this last quality. When Godwin was writing the Life of Chatham, his friend Fawcet repeated to him one of the statesman's eloquent perorations on the familiar text about an Englishman's house. "The rains," said the orator, "might enter it, and the winds might enter it, but the king might not." In Godwin's version this became, "The winds of heaven may whistle round it, but the king may not"—a statement revealing quite a new constitutional check.

Godwin's two successful novels, Caleb Williams and St. Leon, are of more interest than the Essays. They seem both to be connected with the speculations of the Political Justice.

(1) Life, i. 294.

(2) "The Enquirer," p. 78.

Caleb Williams was intended, as the original preface declared, to give a "general review of the modes of domestic and unrecorded despotism by which man becomes the destroyer of man." Godwin had himself explained sensibly enough, though with some queer illustrations, the obvious objection to the hybrid genus of pamphlet novels. Homer, he thinks, meant the *Iliad* as an "example of the fatal consequences of discord among political allies." In practice it has enhanced "the false lustre of military achievements."¹ Whatever Homer meant, the efficient moral of a story is apt to differ from that intended by the author. In fact, the logical objection is as strong as the artistic. A novel can show at most what would happen if the novelist were in the place of Providence. From Caleb Williams it would be difficult to draw any decided inference. Falkland, the refined hero, is supposed to be a victim to the absurd superstitions of honour. This induces him, first, to murder a ruffian who has grossly insulted him; then to allow two innocent men to be hanged for the crime; and finally to carry out, for many years, a relentless persecution of poor Caleb Williams, who has divined his secret. The most obvious moral is that you ought not to have half a conscience. If Falkland had been thoroughly virtuous, he would not have committed murder; if thoroughly vicious, he would not have been tortured to death by remorse. But fortunately this childish design of enforcing a political theory did not spoil Godwin's story. The situation is impressive, and, in spite of many clumsy details, is impressively represented. The spectacle of a man of delicate sense of honour writhing under the dread of detection, and opposed by an incarnation of vulgar curiosity, moves us to forget the superfluous moral.

A similar conception has been worked out in two well-known modern novels, Paul Ferroll, and Eugene Aram. Godwin appears, from a paper described by Mr. Paul, to have thought of treating the last subject himself; and possibly suggested it to the late Lord Lytton, who was one of his latest youthful admirers. The contrast between Eugene Aram and Caleb Williams is curious. The later novelist has altogether the advantage in the construction of the plot and the attention to artistic proprieties. There is a correct love affair interwoven with thorough literary skill; the chief figures are dexterously balanced; there is a proper comic man in the background; a sentimental conclusion to a secondary story to contrast with the tragic conclusion of the main plot; and except that Aram himself is an intolerable stick, and discourses about the True and Beautiful, no judicious critic could find fault with the design or execution. Godwin has no such mechanical skill, and little of what we should

(1) *Ib.*, 133.

call poetical imagination. His characters do not live, and are not dexterously picked out. A love story which is intruded is commonplace and rather coarse. A rambling account of a den of thieves suggests recollections of *Gil Blas*. It is meant to be politically instructive, and is tiresome and irrelevant; and yet the story lays hold of us. The main reason is obvious. The author may not have mastered the story, but the story has mastered him. He is possessed and dominated by his characters. Though he is neither a Fielding nor a Scott, he interests us as he would have interested us by describing a real set of adventures of similar character. In the hands of a more powerful writer, Falkland and his victim might have been more alive; but few writers could have communicated to us more vividly the strong fascination by which Godwin watches the creatures of his fancy. His straightforward sincerity and the genuine interest of a moralist in the working out of an ethical problem are at the bottom of Godwin's success.

St. Leon is an inferior work. Here, too, indeed, there is a striking situation, possibly suggested by Godwin's speculations on human immortality. A ruined noble has retired to a quiet retreat to enjoy domestic happiness. He hospitably receives an old man, persecuted, broken down, and anxious to die, who slowly intimates that he is the possessor of the secret of immortality and of the philosopher's stone. *St. Leon* may only have it on condition of revealing it to no one. It has been a curse to its proprietor, who has learnt the folly of trying to "vary from the kindly ways of man." *St. Leon's* temptation, his unwillingness to possess a secret which will separate him from his family gradually yielding to the desire of boundless wealth and life, is strikingly set forth. Here Godwin has to deal with a problem to his taste; and he writes with a power reminding us of Caleb Williams. Enough is done to suggest that the story might be impressive in other hands. An immortal man is surely a theme for a great artist. The Wandering Jew seems to be a legend as appropriate for poetical treatment as *Faust*, though it has not been fortunate enough to find a higher sponsor than Eugène Sue. Hawthorne, in his unfinished novel, seems to have been thinking of a similar motive; and we may wonder what he would have made of the strange psychological problems suggested by a man overwhelmed by the too complete fruition of his desires, cut off from human sympathy by immunity from human suffering, and at last anxious only to resign the gift for which we should all at first sight profess to be anxious. But Godwin makes the interest turn almost exclusively upon the difficulty felt by *St. Leon* in accounting for his sudden wealth. That is a difficulty which might surely have been surmounted by a man of talent with a possible eternity in front of him. The story becomes a rather commonplace romance, devoted

in great part to an attack upon the Inquisition, and now barely readable.

It is needless to speak of Godwin's labours as an antiquarian and a manufacturer of children's books. It was not by such work that he made a mark on the world. They were written to gain bread, not influence. If he expected more from the essays, long afterwards published, upon the Christian religion, his calculations were mistaken. He said nothing that can now be startling, or that was novel even at the time of writing. But his creed deserves a word of notice, if only as greatly influencing and probably identical with the creed of Shelley. Godwin was called an Atheist, and, in a sense, may have deserved the name. We find his nephew, Charles Clairmont, lamenting pathetically that "the idea of God and a future state is so deeply rooted" in him that he fears that he will "never be able to get over it."¹ Conscientious perseverance may do much in such matters. When, however, another disciple of Godwin boasts of having made a convert to Atheism, Godwin rebukes him, and calls his "zeal of proselytism" in such a cause unnatural.² Godwin explains that he does not believe in an "intellectual God, a God made after the image of man," but that he thinks a man wrong who is without a sense of religion. From other passages it seems that Godwin was in a state of mind common enough, though not so commonly avowed. He distinctly disbelieves in the God of Christianity, and regards him as not only a fiction, but an immoral fiction. He does not "believe in God" as those words would be understood by a Deist, or even by a Pantheist. His belief, if it is to be called a belief, is too vague to be fixed in a formula. It vanishes when looked at directly. But he feels deeply the importance of those vague emotions of awful reverence which are prompted by a calm contemplation of the mysteries and infinities of the surrounding universe, and is anxious to preserve without attempting to explain or justify them. In later years he seems to have become more tolerant to the established order, and less anxious to upset existing beliefs. Yet the legacy of essays called by him *Christianity Unveiled*, after the familiar title of Holbach's essay, was meant as a destructive attack upon the popular creed, and it is significant of the change of feeling that a man so genuinely convinced of the supreme importance of a candid utterance of all opinions, did not think it a duty to fire the mine in his lifetime. Mr. Mill tells us in his *Autobiography* that reticence upon such points was considered to be a duty in his youth, and the bankrupt bookseller may be excused for not openly expressing the scepticism which men of more independent position desired to retain in a smouldering condition.

LESLIE STEPHEN.

(1) *Life*, ii. 187.

(2) *Id.*, ii. 263.

MORMONISM FROM A MORMON POINT OF VIEW.

DURING a recent visit to Salt Lake City I happened to ask one of the leading Mormons what works, in addition to the Book of Mormon, would give me a fair idea of the religious doctrines professed by the Latter-day Saints and of their history, as they themselves desire to have it told. The gentleman addressed most kindly offered for my acceptance several books, among which were Pamphlets by Orson Pratt, one of the twelve Apostles of the Church, the Key to the Science of Theology by Parley P. Pratt, and the Rise, Progress, and Travels of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints by President George A. Smith.

So far as religious tenets are concerned, the authority of the works mentioned may doubtless be accepted as final. With regard to the historical portion of the subject it is different, and here a certain allowance must be made for the bias of a religious partisan; but it is not the less interesting to read this brief, but stirring history, as it is told by those who played a prominent part in its events. Having studied these books, I shall endeavour to give a short account of Mormonism, as it is described by the Mormons themselves, and as it appears to myself, being personally little predisposed to regard it favourably, but convinced that its case has seldom been fairly stated to the public.

A certain practical importance attaches at present to the subject, for the future position of Mormonism in the Union is among the many difficult political problems now offering themselves for solution in the United States of America. It presents indeed, upon a small scale, a similar difficulty to that caused by the existence of slavery in the Southern States: as to how far it is possible to maintain political federation between communities differing essentially in their social institutions. The American Constitution is wonderfully elastic, but it has proved impossible to retain slaveholding States permanently within its limits. Is its elasticity sufficient to admit into the Union a State which would legalise polygamy? Hitherto a negative answer has been given by Congress to this question, and the claims of Utah Territory to become a State have been urged in vain; but the steady increase of population and wealth is constantly strengthening those claims, and they cannot much longer be ignored. The fourth unsuccessful attempt to obtain admission as a State of the Union was made in 1872, when the population of Utah already exceeded that of Nevada and Nebraska combined (at the date of their admission), being upwards of 105,000; and a memorial to

Congress was adopted, praying for admission into the Union as a Sovereign State. The constitution then proposed for the State, which was to bear the name of Deseret, was approved by the people of the Territory, with only 368 dissentient votes; it provided for women's suffrage, and minority representation.

The admission of Nevada, Nebraska, and Colorado, all of them neighbouring territories with inferior population to Utah, appears to justify the assertion of the Mormons that the unpopularity of their religion was the sole cause of their exclusion. Had Deseret been created a Sovereign State in 1872, the controversy as to polygamy might have entered upon a new and critical phase, as the State Legislature would doubtless have claimed the right to legalise plurality of wives within its own jurisdiction. No such right can be claimed by the existing legislature of Utah, whose powers are restricted by the provisions of the Act of 1850, to which the Territory owes its political existence. All laws of the Territorial legislature must have the sanction of the Governor (who is appointed by the President of the United States), and are passed subject to the approval of Congress. The Judges of the Territorial Supreme Court are also appointed by the President, so that the control of the Federal authorities is complete over all departments in the Territory, and it is natural that the Mormon community should aspire to a more independent position. It is questionable, however, whether independence would not prove a disadvantage to the Mormons, as tending to bring them into direct collision with popular feeling, which has always been more or less hostile to them throughout the Union, while the Federal authorities have acted a friendly part. During seventeen sessions of the Utah Legislative Assembly, the power of disapproval has only once been exercised by Congress, and then (as might have been expected) in relation to the law of marriage. The Washington Government has afforded protection to the Mormons against local officers and judges, President Grant, in particular, having recently braved considerable unpopularity by removing the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Utah for "arbitrary and illegal conduct" in his dealings with the Latter-day Saints. Again, a few years ago the United States officials in Utah set at naught the Territorial law under which jurors were selected and summoned, rejecting those who professed their belief in Mormon doctrines. Where the value at issue exceeds \$1,000, an appeal lies to the Supreme Court of the United States, and a case tried by a packed jury, and given against the municipal officers of Salt Lake City, was accordingly appealed. The unanimous decision of the Supreme Court at Washington was, that the jury had not been legally impanelled, and the judgment of the Utah court was reversed. Great rejoicing was caused at Salt Lake City by this decision in the

Engelbrecht case, as proving that the inhabitants of territories had rights in common with their countrymen, and that there was justice in the United States even for the professors of a very unpopular religion.

It may appear strange that in the freest of lands, and in the latter half of the nineteenth century, a legal doubt should have existed as to whether civil disabilities were attached to any form of religious opinion; but it must be remembered that the evidence of an atheist was very recently rejected in English courts of justice, and the Legislature of North Carolina expelled last year a member, because he conscientiously declared his disbelief in the existence of a God. The fact is that, even in Protestant countries, complete religious toleration is limited to certain recognised persuasions, so that feeble and unpopular sects have still to unite in claiming for themselves the same liberty of conscience which has been conceded to all numerous and powerful dissenting bodies. Science now demands from theology absolute and unconditional freedom, and the day can hardly be far distant when theological heterodoxy will cease to involve any civil penalties in a free country. At present the Mormon refugees of the Rocky Mountains demand only that amount of civil and religious liberty which the Constitution professes to guarantee to every American citizen, and which the Pilgrim Fathers found for themselves "on the wild New England shore." They complain that their enemies have told their story, that their own statements have been ignored, and that no credit has been given to them for an honest attempt, in these latter days, to put in practice the doctrines of the early Christian Church. Even their enemies will hardly deny that they displayed faith, courage, and endurance, when they resolved, after being expelled from one settlement after another, to plunge into the unknown wilderness, and to found a new Zion beyond the existing limits of the United States. These qualities have triumphed over great physical difficulties, and a stranger is astonished at the prosperity which Mormon industry has produced. A carefully organised system of irrigation has converted a barren desert into a productive garden, and has had the remarkable effect of raising the permanent level of the lake ten feet higher than it was in 1850. Every requirement of the religious community is abundantly supplied by contributions, assessed and collected upon voluntary principles. Besides the immense new tabernacle, a temple is now in course of construction, almost Egyptian in its massive grandeur, towards which all the faithful contribute, those who cannot afford money giving their labour. The Indians in Utah have been conciliated by the humane policy of feeding, clothing, and teaching, instead of fighting them. The old accusations of violence and cruelty towards Gentile emigrants, or Mormon deserters, if not altogether disproved, have at least been

lived down in recent times, and the existence of a military camp near Salt Lake City is now, probably, more unnecessary than it would be at any other town west of the Rocky Mountains. In order to appreciate the tranquillity, sobriety, and steady industry of Deseret (as the Mormons prefer to name their country), it may be contrasted with Nevada, an adjoining State almost identical with Deseret as to soil, climate, and mineral products. The so-called Silver State stands now pre-eminent in the Union for its turbulent manners, for the number of its liquor-shops, and as being the only State which legalises public gambling. Of course Nevada is merely passing through a certain rude stage of her existence, just as California has done before her, and she, too, will one day set her house in order; the remarkable point is that Utah should, alone among the young communities of the far west, have altogether escaped such a condition of things. To many persons this will appear to be sufficiently explained by the fact that the Mormons both preach and practise habits of extreme temperance, almost amounting to total abstinence from every sort of stimulant.

Considerable hostility undoubtedly exists between the Mormons and some of their Gentile fellow-residents; this is greatly due to the bitter attacks of certain local newspapers upon the Latter-day Saints, and upon those who show them any favour. When I was in Salt Lake City the Governor of Utah Territory was very severely assailed for his alleged partiality towards the Mormons, and a grim hope was at the same time expressed that Mr. Brigham Young might shortly take the place merited by him "at the only fireside, which we know of, large enough to accommodate him and the whole of his family." That such expressions are publicly used in speaking of a man whom the great bulk of the community regard as an inspired prophet, is a sufficient proof that no terrorism is now exercised against dissenters from the dominant church of Utah. To a stranger like myself, desirous of understanding as far as possible the tenets of their faith, a frank and friendly reception was accorded by such of the Mormon leaders as I had an opportunity of visiting. Every explanation asked for was at once afforded, but I do not feel justified in mentioning names, or in repeating any private conversation, although it was probably not intended to be confidential. A passing stranger can only see the external surface of society, and in this respect there is nothing very remarkable in Salt Lake City. The parlour of a flourishing Mormon householder does not differ much in appearance from that of an Englishman, who happens to have a numerous family, with a large proportion of sisters or daughters. A new and somewhat startling sensation is, however, experienced during the ceremony of introduction on first hearing the words: "Now, Sir, let me introduce you to another of my wives." The

strangeness of these words mainly consists in the very fact that they are uttered, not by a dark-skinned barbarian, but by a gentleman answering to the description of the English soldiers given by Le Conscriit de 1813: "blancs, bien rasés, comme de bons bourgeois,"—and in a room with all the familiar surroundings of civilised domestic life. The public worship of the Ghurch of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, as the Mormons invariably designate their own sect, is conducted with great simplicity, very much as it is in an English dissenting chapel, and the preponderance of ladies is by no means greater than that to which we are accustomed in places of worship generally.* The only marked peculiarity is the administration of the Lord's Supper in water instead of wine, and of this sacrament it appears to be customary for all the faithful present to partake, old and young alike. The hymns are sung by a mixed choir of young men and women, and addresses are delivered by eminent Mormon elders. When I was present the speakers were Mr. Daniel H. Wells, mayor of Salt Lake City, and Mr. Cannon, brother of the delegate from Utah Territory to Congress. All religious argument was based upon the authority of the Bible, to which the Mormon revelations claim to be *additional*, but in no sense *contrary*. Various Mormon doctrines were touched upon, and special allusions were made to the persecutions undergone by the Saints in past times, and to those which appeared to menace them in the future. Although not yet half a century old, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has passed through a baptism of fire, and living men can speak with mingled pride and sorrow of personal friends who died as martyrs to their religious faith. Thirty years ago Nauvoo in Illinois was a Mormon settlement, almost equal in population and prosperity to Salt Lake City at the present day; those who witnessed its total destruction can hardly be considered idle alarmists, when they allude to the possibility of trials yet to come. The tone of the speakers was thoroughly practical, exhorting to industry and sobriety, to abstention from all stimulants, including tobacco, coffee, and tea, and to the cultivation of all the useful arts, "even those of war, if necessary to the safety of our community." These exhortations were mainly addressed to the juniors present, a saving clause being inserted for those seniors who had borne the burden and heat of the evil days, and who, having now established this mountain refuge for the Saints, might require to "solace decaying nature" with an occasional narcotic. The addresses breathed a tolerant and rational spirit, the doctrines inculcated were simply those of a charitable form of Christianity, and there was no mention of that peculiar domestic institution which sums up in the minds of so many all notions connected with Mormonism.

After all it is upon "plural marriages" that the interest as well

as the hostility of the outer world has always been concentrated; a Mormon is simply regarded as a man with a number of wives, and beyond this most people know little, and care less, as to the doctrines or customs of the Latter-day Saints. Were it not for their polygamy, it seems probable that the Mormons might now enjoy the same perfect toleration which is extended in America to other forms of religious eccentricity, and that Deseret would long ere this have taken her place among the States of the Union. On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that polygamy is a comparatively recent innovation, condemned by the Book of Mormon in the strongest possible terms:—

“The word of God burthens me because of your grosser crimes. For behold, thus saith the Lord, this people (the Nephites) begin to wax in iniquity; they understand not the scriptures; for they seek to excuse themselves because of the things which were written concerning David and Solomon his son. Behold, David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines, which thing was abominable before me, saith the Lord; wherefore, thus saith the Lord, I have led this people forth out of the land of Jerusalem, by the power of mine arm, that I might raise up unto me a righteous branch from the fruit of the loins of Joseph. Wherefore I, the Lord God, will not suffer that this people shall do like unto them of old. Wherefore, my brethren, hear me, and hearken to the word of the Lord; for there shall not any man among you have save it be one wife, and concubines he shall have none; for I, the Lord God, delighteth (sic) in the chastity of women.”

These are the words of “Jacob, the brother of Nephi,” and words could hardly be more distinct or emphatic; but theologians can generally manage to explain away inconvenient texts and hard sayings, while in this case it may be held by the Saints that the above injunctions were repealed by the subsequent Revelation on Celestial Marriage. This tardy revelation, vouchsafed to Joseph Smith shortly before the close of his career, is the sole warrant for plurality of wives—a practice which is general among the Mormon leaders, but not throughout the community at large. With them, as with Mahometans or Hindoos, polygamy is doubtless very much a question of expense, and I was informed on good authority that probably about one in four of the Saints is the husband of more than one wife. The majority, therefore, adheres in practice to the “Doctrine and Covenants,” which book is a recognised authority upon articles of Mormon faith, and declares “that one man should have one wife, and one woman but one husband, except in case of death, when either is at liberty to marry again.” The number of wives ascribed to eminent individuals is usually exaggerated, sixteen being the largest number admittedly married to one man, and six constituting the household of a wealthy and influential elder.

The Mormons compare themselves to the Jews, as well as to the early Christians; they have been a persecuted people, driven forth to wander through trackless deserts, and are now living apart from

their neighbours in a theocratic commonwealth of their own. Their precedents on behalf of polygamy are mainly drawn from the Hebrew Scriptures; but they also assert that they have in their favour the example of the primitive Christian Church. Without going into their arguments, it may be at once conceded that polygamy was sanctioned by the ancient Hebrew law; but it is not the less out of date in the new world of America, and is a standing peril to the Church of 'Latter-day Saints. By an act of the Utah Legislature the right of suffrage has been conferred on "all American women, native or naturalised," and it hardly seems possible that polygamy can long survive such legislation. At present the extension of the franchise among persons, few of whom are "native" Americans, and many of whom are very imperfectly educated, probably strengthens the hands of the Mormon leaders by swamping entirely the Gentile element. But such an effect is not likely to be permanent, for the rising generation will be educated; in 1871, just after the passing of the act above referred to, sixty per cent. of the girls between four and sixteen years of age were enrolled as scholars throughout Utah Territory, being slightly in excess of the percentage among boys of the same age. Equality between the sexes in education and in electoral privileges must tend to bring about social and religious equality also, and the example of their independent sisters in Wyoming Territory, where women enjoy complete civil rights, will not be thrown away upon the ladies of Salt Lake City. The tone of public feeling throughout the neighbouring states and territories is more favourable towards "woman's rights" than it is in any other part of the world; and even if this be partly due to a reaction produced by Mormonism, it cannot fail in time to influence the female electors of Utah. Thus it is possible that a peaceable solution of the difficulty may be found, and polygamy may be abolished, not by external force, but by constitutional action within the Mormon community itself.

Meanwhile, this church of the nineteenth century possesses amazing vitality, and seems to carry us back to a bygone era of belief, exhibiting as it does the phenomenon of a religious sect heartily convinced of its future mission and claiming the present for its own. While other churches look to the past for all that is best and truest in religion, the Latter-day Saints regard the present also as a period of miracle and revelation. They expect, in the immediate future, the conversion of all who inhabit their vast continent with as serene a confidence as that with which the early Christians seem to have anticipated the evangelisation of the Roman Empire. It may be said of them that in theology they maintain the modern doctrine of continuity, rather than ancient theories of convulsion and catastrophe. Accepting, in a literal sense, the Jewish and

Christian Scriptures, they apparently entertain no fear lest scientific research should undermine their faith, as they look for a continuous course of revelation, which shall harmonise theology with the general advance in human knowledge.

The title of Parley P. Pratt's recent work, *Key to the Science of Theology*, 1874, may seem almost to involve a contradiction in terms; but it indicates the desire of a distinguished Mormon theologian to keep abreast, if possible, of the scientific spirit of the age. Whether the attempt to do this may have proved successful or not, his policy is surely wiser than that which has frequently placed science and theology in opposition, so direct, that every conquest of knowledge over ignorance has appeared to be also a victory over religion. Indeed, Mr. Parley Pratt is entitled to a welcome from the lovers of free thought, considering how rarely theologians seek to identify the progress of their own tenets with that of humanity in every department of science and art, and how seldom it is that they do not

"Grow pale

Lest their own judgments should become too bright,
And their free thoughts be crimes, and earth have too much light."

To quote his own words:—

"The creeds of the Fathers seem to have been cast in the mould of other ages, to be adapted to a more narrow sphere of intellectual development, and to be composed of material too much resembling cast-iron; or, at least not sufficiently elastic to expand with the expansion of mind, to grow with the growth, and advance with the progressive principles of the age. For these reasons, perhaps more than any other, the master spirits of the age are breaking loose from the old moorings, and withdrawing from established and venerated systems."

Holding these views, Mr. Parley Pratt has aimed at embodying, in his introductory key, a general view of what he calls the Science of Theology, "in a concise and somewhat original manner and style, as gathered from revelation, history, prophecy, reason, and analogy." The revelation and prophecy referred to and founded upon are: partly those accepted by all orthodox Christians, partly those of recent date (such as the Book of Mormon and the Doctrine and Covenants) peculiar to the followers of Joseph Smith. It is hard to reconcile polygamy with "the progressive principles of the age," and with modern ideas as to the social position and dignity of woman; but Mr. Parley Pratt is not without a scientific plea on behalf of his theological dogma. He maintains that—

"The principal object contemplated by this law is the multiplication of the children of good and worthy fathers, who will teach them the truth, and this is far preferable to sending them into the world in the lineage of an unworthy or ignorant parentage."—"A wise legislation, or the law of God, would punish with just severity the crimes of adultery or fornication, and would not suffer the idiot, the confirmed, irreclaimable drunkard, the man of hereditary disease,

or of vicious habits, to possess or retain a wife ; while at the same time it would provide for a good and capable man to honorably receive and entertain more wives than one."—"The restoration of pure laws and practices has already commenced to improve or regenerate a race. A holy and temperate life ; pure morals and manners ; faith, hope, charity ; cheerfulness, gentleness, integrity ; intellectual development, pure truth, and knowledge will produce a race more beautiful in form and features, stronger and more vigorous in constitution, happier in temperament and disposition, more intellectual, less vicious, and better prepared for long life and good days in their mortal sojourn. Each generation governed by the same laws will still improve."

This sounds plausible enough in theory, and perhaps the result of polygamy as practised in Utah is, that a large proportion of offspring is born to the most energetic, intelligent, and industrious citizens. In an age when there is reason to fear an increasing tendency to "non-survival of the fittest," such a result may be admitted as tending to counterbalance some of the disadvantages attending plurality of wives.

The highest types of domestic animals have been developed under a system of breeding and selection, very similar to that which is advocated in the above quotations, and the burden of proof seems to rest upon those who maintain that a high type of humanity cannot be developed after a similar fashion. Should the Mormons succeed in carrying out practically, for a few generations, any such ideas as are above alleged to be the main objects contemplated in their law of polygamy, they would have fair grounds for the belief that they are destined to inherit the whole earth.

A race of human beings developed (if such a thing were feasible) by strictly scientific selection and culture could not fail to gain the upper hand in the general struggle for dominion, but it remains to be seen whether any success in this direction will attend the system of the Mormons.

"Our physical organisation, health, vigour, strength of body, intellectual faculties, inclinations, &c., are influenced very much by parentage. Hereditary disease, idiocy, weakness of mind, or of constitution, deformity, tendency to violent and ungovernable passions, vicious appetites and desires, are engendered by parents ; and are bequeathed as a heritage from generation to generation."

These are the words of a leading apologist of polygamy, who founds an argument in his own favour upon this truth, now generally admitted, but almost as generally ignored. It is impossible here to discuss so wide and so difficult a question, and I must limit myself to these few brief quotations from the *Key to the Science of Theology*, leaving the reader to judge of their worth.

The series of pamphlets by Orson Pratt contains discussions on a great variety of questions connected with Mormonism. In particular the "Divine Authenticity of the Book of Mormon" is considered at great length, as well as the question : "Was Joseph Smith sent of God ?"

Mr. Orson Pratt endeavours to show, in the first place, that to expect more revelation is not *unscriptural*; secondly, that it is not *unreasonable*; and thirdly, that it is *indispensably necessary*. He then goes on to compare the evidences of the Book of Mormon and of the Bible, alleging that both alike have been confirmed by miracles, and that the prophecies of the Bible, especially those of Isaiah, have been fulfilled in the Book of Mormon and in the history of Mormonism. Throughout his elaborate arguments he assumes the genuineness and authenticity of the Bible, an assumption which he is of course entitled to make in arguing with orthodox Christians. His position is: The truth of the Bible rests upon sufficient evidence, and this evidence is in every way weaker than that which can be adduced for the Book of Mormon—therefore, *a fortiori*, the Book of Mormon is true. Whatever may be the flaw in this syllogism, those whom Archdeacon Paley satisfies cannot fail to have some trouble in disposing of Mr. Orson Pratt. Towards other Christian sects, whose creeds “are an abomination unto the Lord,” the Mormon apostle displays but little brotherly feeling. Upon Papist and Protestant alike he pours out the vial of his wrath and contempt in language almost too forcible for quotation, but he seeks to base every reproach directed against them upon texts from the orthodox Scriptures. The pamphlet, entitled: “The Bible and tradition, without further revelation, an insufficient guide,” is, in fact, a powerful onslaught upon modern Christendom, perhaps as damaging as any that a professed unbeliever could have made, although in this case the assailant accepts with reverence the Christian Scriptures, seeking to found thereon a revelation newer and more complete.

It is somewhat disappointing, if the Book of Mormon is to be accepted as the new revelation, to find it so very inferior, alike in matter and in style, to its great predecessors. Nearly equal in bulk to the Old Testament, it lacks altogether the poetic grandeur and the graphic force of the Hebrew Scriptures, although the biblical phraseology has been laboriously imitated throughout. It is styled: “An Account written by the Hand of Mormon upon Plates taken from the Plates of Nephi. Translated by Joseph Smith, Jun.”

“Wherefore it is an abridgment of the record of the people of Nephi, and also of the Lamanites; written to the Lamanites, who are a remnant of the House of Israel; and also to Jew and Gentile: written by way of commandment, and also by the spirit of prophecy and of revelation. Written and sealed up, and hid up unto the Lord, that they might not be destroyed; to come forth by the gift and power of God unto the interpretation thereof: sealed by the hand of Moroni, and hid up unto the Lord, to come forth in due time by the hand of Gentile; the interpretation thereof by the gift of God.”

“An abridgment taken from the Book of Ether also; which is a record of the people of Jared; who were scattered at the time the Lord confounded the language of the people when they were building a tower to get to Heaven; which is to show unto the remnant of the House of Israel what great things the Lord hath done for their fathers; and that they may know the covenants of the

The sacred volume is divided into thirteen books, bearing the names of various prophets, one of whom is Mormon. The last book is that of Moroni, who says :—

“ Behold I, Moroni, do finish the record of my Father, Mormon. Behold, I have but few things to write, which things I have been commanded by my Father. And now it came to pass that after the great and tremendous battle at Cumorah, behold, the Nephites who had escaped into the country southward, were hunted by the Lamanites, until they were all destroyed; and my father also was killed by them, and I, even remain alone to write the sad tale of the destruction of my people. But behold, they are gone, and I fulfil the commandment of my father. And whether they will slay me, I know not; therefore I will write and hide up the records in the earth, and whither I go it mattereth not. Behold my Father hath made this record, and he hath written the intent thereof. And behold, I would write it also, if I had room upon the plates; but I have not; and ore I have none, for I am alone; my father hath been slain in battle, and all my kinsfolks, and I have not friends, nor whither to go; and how long the Lord will suffer that I may live, I know not. Behold, four hundred years have passed away since the coming of our Lord and Saviour.”

“ And now behold, we have written this record according to our knowledge in the characters, which are called among us the reformed Egyptian, being handed down and altered by us, according to our manner of speech. And if our plates had been sufficiently large, we should have written in Hebrew; but the Hebrew hath been altered by us also; and if we could have written in Hebrew, behold, ye would have had no imperfection in our record. But the Lord knoweth the things which we have written, and also that none other people knoweth our language, therefore he hath prepared means for the interpretation thereof. And those things are written, that we may rid our garments of the blood of our brethren who have dwindled in unbelief. And behold, these things which we have desired concerning our brethren, yea, even their restoration to the knowledge of Christ, is according to the prayers of all the saints who have dwelt in the land. And may the Lord Jesus Christ grant that their prayers may be answered according to their faith; and may God the Father remember the covenant which he hath made with the house of Israel; and may he bless them for ever, through faith on the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.”

The record in question professes to contain a history of the American continent from the date of its first colonisation by Jared and his brother at the time of the dispersal from Babel down to the year A.D. 420, when Moroni, the last of the Nephite prophets, buried his plates in the hill of Cumorah. This account of pre-historic America is but a tedious composition, full of battles and slaughter, full of proper names, of reiterations, and of unnecessary phrases. We are told how the Jaredites, emigrants from the valley of Nimrod, who “ did carry with them Deseret, which by interpretation is a honey-bee,” attained to great civilisation and prosperity in North America, and were utterly destroyed by internecine warfare about the year 600 B.C. They were succeeded by a “ remnant of the house

of Joseph," brought from Jerusalem in the reign of Zedekiah to inherit the land. These appear to have crossed the Pacific Ocean, landing on the west coast of South America, whence they eventually overspread that continent. They separated before long into two distinct nations, known as Nephites and Lamanites, the former migrating from the persecutions of the latter, and sailing "forth into the west sea by the narrow neck, which led into the land northward." Through the personal ministry of Jesus Christ, who visited them shortly after his ascension, the Nephites were converted from the Mosaic to the Christian faith, which was in time accepted by the Lamanites also; and for two hundred years they prospered and multiplied, and there was no contention in the land, all things being common among them. This golden age was succeeded by a period of apostasy; "and from that time forth they did have their goods and their substance no more common among them, and they began to be divided into classes, and they began to build up churches unto themselves, to get gain, and began to deny the true church of Christ." A terrible war broke out between the Nephites, now settled in North America (known as the land Desolation), and the Lamanites, who invaded them from the land Bountiful, lying southward of the Isthmus of Darien. This war ended in the annihilation of the Nephites, "an exceeding fair and delightsome people," while a degraded remnant of the Lamanites still survive, after fifteen centuries of rapine and discord, under the name of American Indians. "Now the heads of the Lamanites were shorn; and they were naked, save it were skin, which was girded about their loins; and the skins of the Lamanites were dark, according to the mark which was set upon their fathers, which was a curse upon them because of their transgression." Thus the term *Gentile* is properly used to denote the *white man*, as distinguished from the copper-coloured house of Israel, and the Mormons themselves are expressly described as the "Gentile Saints." For the remnant of Joseph a glorious future is prophesied. They, the despised redskins, shall have the land for their inheritance, and it shall be "a land of liberty unto the Gentiles, and there shall be no kings upon the land." They are to be the chief agents in building the New Jerusalem, and will be converted and redeemed before their brethren of Judah.

The story of the plates, from which the sacred book is said to have been translated, first into English, and subsequently into nearly all the European languages, is of some interest from an archaeological point of view, and may be told in a few words. They are described as having been found by Joseph Smith in a cyst composed of six stones, smooth on the inner surfaces, and firmly cemented together. This stone box was buried in the side of a hill near Palmyra, in the state of New York. The plates had the appearance of gold, were six by eight inches in width and length, each plate

being nearly as thick as common tin. They were filled on both sides with small characters beautifully engraved, and were fastened at one edge with three rings running through the whole: thus bound together they formed a volume about six inches in thickness, a part of which was sealed. Various unsuccessful attempts were made by the enemies of Joseph Smith to obtain possession of these plates, and they finally disappeared, having been examined and described by eleven persons, whose testimony, signed with their names, is added to the Book of Mormon.

The evidence of these persons would have been more conclusive had not all of them been believers in the new prophet; moreover the disappearance of the plates is not quite satisfactorily explained by the statement that they were restored to the charge of the angel under whose guidance they were discovered. Still the actual existence, as well as the genuine antiquity, of plates such as Joseph Smith is said to have brought to light in 1827, seems to have been sufficiently verified elsewhere.

In 1843, near Kinderhook, Illinois, in excavating a large mound six brass plates were discovered, of a bell shape, four inches in length, and covered with ancient characters. They were fastened together with two iron wires, almost entirely corroded, and were found, along with charcoal, ashes, and human bones, more than twelve feet below the surface of a mound of the sugar-loaf form common in the Mississippi Valley. Large trees growing upon these artificial mounds attest their great antiquity, and doubtless they contain much that will reward future investigation. No key has yet been discovered for the interpretation of the engravings upon these brass plates, or of the strange glyphs upon the ruins of Otolum in Mexico; but when an amount of talent, learning, and labour, equal to that bestowed upon Egyptian hieroglyphics or Assyrian cuneiform characters, has been devoted to American antiquities, we may hope to learn something of those mysterious races whose history the Book of Mormon professes to tell.

But if we admit that the plates themselves may have been genuine, our faith in the founder of Mormonism, as a sincere religious enthusiast, is staggered by his mode of interpreting their contents. He tells us that he found along with the records an instrument, called by him the Urim and Thummim, and described as consisting of "two transparent stones set in the rim of a bow." Through the medium of this instrument, he says that he translated the unsealed portion of these scanty records, the result being a bulky volume in English, but he does not explain whether he used it as a magnifier, nor how it proved to be a Rosetta stone for his hieroglyphics, merely asserting that it was "by the gift and power of God." That Joseph Smith believed in his own mission his character and career alike appear to indicate, and the many ecstatic visions which he describes

were probably real enough to him, but the compilation of the Book of Mormon was an act involving much time and labour, and cannot be accounted for by ecstasy.

In these days of La Salette and Paray le Monial it is, perhaps, too much to say that a miracle, in order to find acceptance among educated persons, must be relegated to a remote age and country, and must be invested with a certain amount of external dignity. It is, however, a severe test of faith to be called upon to accept miracles and revelations from a prophet well known to men yet living as "Joe Smith," and referred to as "Mr. S." in the writings of so eminent a disciple as Mr. Orson Pratt. A most remarkable man Mr. S. undoubtedly was, capable of inspiring alike *inestinguibil odio, ed indomato amor*. The bitter hostility of his opponents was more than equalled by the devoted zeal of his converts, and although murdered by mob violence at the early age of thirty-eight, he had already so well accomplished his work, that the new creed, instead of dying with him, continued to spread with increasing rapidity, and was preached by his apostles and elders in every quarter of the globe. He was a New Englander, born A.D. 1805 in the State of Vermont, and began to have visions when he was about fourteen years of age. In 1830 the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was first organised at Fayette in the State of New York, and its headquarters were moved gradually westward, until a considerable settlement was formed in Jackson County, Missouri. Here it was expected that the New Jerusalem would be built, but an organised system of persecution drove the Saints out of the State of Missouri, and in 1839 they took refuge in Illinois, where they built the city of Nauvoo in Hancock County, on the banks of the Mississippi, and enjoyed a short respite from persecution. But in 1844 popular hostility broke out with increased violence, and Joseph Smith (who had been frequently brought before judicial tribunals, and invariably acquitted) proceeded with his brother Hyrum to Carthage, where they surrendered themselves prisoners on a charge of treason, the Governor of Illinois having promised them protection and a fair trial. On the 27th of June, 1844, a large body of men, with their faces blackened, surrounded the prison, and murdered the two brothers Smith. Several of these men were indicted for murder, and were tried about a year later, but they were acquitted. The persecution of the Mormons did not slacken after the death of their prophet, and in September, 1845, an armed mob commenced burning houses in Hancock County, while the authorities declared that the State was unable to protect the Mormons, and they must therefore go. Preparations were made by Brigham Young, President of the Twelve Apostles, and the other leaders of the church to explore the Rocky Mountains in accordance with an expressed intention of the deceased prophet, and in February, 1846, the exodus

of the Mormons commenced. It was not, however, rapid enough to satisfy their enemies, and in September the city of Nauvoo was burnt by an armed mob, after several days' siege, and the remnant of the Mormons was driven across the Mississippi into Iowa. In the spring of 1847 Brigham Young, with a party of pioneers, started from his winter quarters on the Missouri in search of a place of settlement. On the 24th of July he reached the Great Salt Lake Valley, after a laborious march of more than one thousand miles through an unexplored country. After erecting a fort, and hoisting the stars and stripes upon what was then Mexican territory, President Young hastened back to the banks of the Missouri, and in the fall of 1848 he arrived once more in Salt Lake Valley with eight hundred waggon, and the main body of the Mormons. The severest hardships were undergone by these people, not only during their march, but during the first two years after settling in this barren valley, four thousand three hundred feet above the sea, but strict discipline was enforced in the camp, and a careful system of rationing was maintained, until an abundant harvest at last put an end to the necessity. In 1850 the Territorial Government of Utah was organised by Act of Congress, and Brigham Young was appointed Governor by the President of the United States. From that time forward the new colony has continued to prosper and progress with almost unexampled rapidity, in spite of great disadvantages as to soil, climate, and situation.

There are few countries on the face of the globe, where the Latter-day Saints have not attempted to preach their gospel, but as a rule their preaching has not been tolerated. The records of their missionary efforts make it obvious enough why they obtain so large a proportion of their converts from Great Britain and Denmark, while so few come from the Roman Catholic countries of Europe; except in Scandinavia and the British Empire, the foreign missions of the Mormons have failed through the opposition of the powers that be, who have not only prohibited the missionaries from preaching, but in many cases have expelled them from the country. Even in Norway, so bitterly hostile were the ecclesiastics as to decide that the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is not a *Christian* sect, in order to deprive it of the protection guaranteed by Norwegian law to all Christian dissenters. Three paragraphs from the Mormon creed, as stated by Joseph Smith himself, will show the injustice of such a decision:—

“ We believe in God, the Eternal Father, and in His Son, Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost. We believe that through the atonement of Christ all mankind may be saved by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the Gospel. We believe that these ordinances are: First, Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; second, Repentance; third, Baptism by immersion for the remission of sins; fourth, Laying on of hands for the Gift of the Holy Ghost.”

It is supposed that a larger percentage of the Danes than of any other nation has hitherto embraced Mormonism, and a Danish newspaper is regularly published at Salt Lake City. Since the separation of Schleswig-Holstein from Denmark, the recruiting-ground of the Mormons has been reduced, as their preaching has been rigidly suppressed in those duchies. Of late years the immigration into Utah from the European missions has varied from one to four thousand persons annually. The most active attempts at propagandism appear to have been made about the years 1852—53, but in this country a Mormon mission was founded as early as 1837, six years before the Revelation on Celestial Marriage had given its peculiar character to Mormonism.

It was not until 1843, thirteen years subsequent to the publication of the Book of Mormon, and to the first organisation of the Church of Latter-day Saints, that Joseph Smith proclaimed this new and startling revelation. The style of the document resembles that of the Book of Mormon, but it reveals "a new and an everlasting covenant," distinctly at variance with the teachings of that book already quoted, and justifies the patriarchs, and David and Solomon, "as touching the principle and doctrine of their having many wives." It is addressed to "my servant Joseph," and confers upon him "the keys and power of the priesthood:—And verily, verily I say unto you, that whatsoever you seal on earth, shall be sealed in heaven." Upon "mine handmaid, Emma Smith, your wife," on the other hand, obedience and submission are inculcated in the strongest terms. She is required to "receive all those that have been given unto my servant Joseph—And I command mine handmaid, Emma Smith, to abide and cleave unto my servant Joseph, and to none else. But if she will not abide this commandment she shall be destroyed, saith the Lord." The revelation contains twenty-five short paragraphs only; it is somewhat apologetic in general tone, and is full of scriptural quotations and precedents. A considerate stipulation is made for the consent of the first bride, when another is to be espoused; "As pertaining to the law of the priesthood:—If any man espouse a virgin, and desire to espouse another, and the first give her consent; and if he espouse the second, and they are virgins, and have vowed to no other man, then is he justified." A marriage contracted under the new covenant, and sealed by the appointed authority is valid to all eternity, whereas in the case of ordinary married persons death terminates the contract, and for them in heaven there will be neither marrying nor giving in marriage.

Such are the terms of Joseph Smith's revelation of Celestial Marriage, which reminds one of the convenient doctrines from time to time revealed to Mahomet upon analogous subjects. One more revelation and prophecy remains to be noticed; it is said to have appeared in the "Pearl of Great Price," published at Liverpool in

1851, and to have been "given by the prophet, seer and revelator, Joseph Smith," on Christmas-day, 1832. The date of publication is the point requiring verification, and a genuine copy of the pamphlet above-named would be invaluable, as the language of the alleged prophecy has no prophetic ambiguity, and the fulfilment has been complete. In a few terse words are described the rebellion of South Carolina, and the consequent civil war, the appeal of the Southern States to Great Britain for aid, the arming of the slaves against their masters, and the outbreak of hostilities with the Indians. If there is any accuracy in the dates as stated, Joseph Smith must have been a man of rare political sagacity and foresight.

At the present day most of our religious creeds and systems resemble the great ecclesiastical edifices of the middle ages; relics of days, when faith was stronger and zeal was warmer. These magnificent relics may indeed be renovated by modern hands, and upon a humble scale they can be reproduced, but the power of originating such buildings has passed away, and ecclesiastical architecture is no longer a living art. So is it with the chief accepted systems of religion; they have come down to us in their existing form from periods with which we have nothing else in common, they are not in harmony with the tone of modern life and thought, and could not have been established in modern times. Nevertheless they stand firmly on their ancient foundations, and will long continue to stand, more or less altered and repaired in accordance with modern exigencies.

But the Mormon church is an exception; it has been founded in these latter days, and may be said to have introduced a new order of ecclesiastical architecture, although ancient materials have been largely employed. Hence the doctrines and history of this Church appear to deserve careful study, for it presents to us a living example of what its mightier predecessors must have been in their early career. The extinct *dinornis* may be studied in the existing *apteryx*, and thus (borrowing a fresh metaphor) among the fossils of the past we seem to find one recent specimen, still full of organic life, illustrating the laws of growth, the habits, and the constitution of those species whose dry bones alone remain to us now. The living *apteryx* seems to be doomed ere long to become like its fossil congeners; if so, the time for study and observation is short.

Even those who have least sympathy with the peculiar doctrines of the Mormons may be willing to enter a protest in their favour, when the issue really lies between religious liberty and persecution. They are the only Christian sect that has suffered in our own days severe persecution at the hands of professing Christians, and their cause on that account demands especial sympathy from all who advocate absolute religious toleration. DAVID WEDDERBURN.

MODERN ENGLISH ARCHITECTURE.

THE past history of Architecture—under which term is here included all building in which any degree of æsthetic expression, over and above the mere materialism of construction, is aimed at—brings before us a long perspective of structures, nearly all of which have arisen under the influence either of despotism or of superstition. Mr. Buckle pointed out the social and political bearing of the story told by the oldest architectural monuments in existence. No wealth, no extravagance could have rendered possible the construction of buildings so vast and useless as the pyramids, save under the supposition of an unlimited power of compelling labour without remuneration: they are the silent witnesses of a tyranny more portentous than any under which men have since placed their necks. Equally do the temples of Egypt, with their forests of granite columns and avenues of sphinxes, which must have been the work of generations, speak of the predominating power of a priesthood overshadowing the length and breadth of the land. In Greece, though we are no longer under the shadow of despotism, architecture is still the handmaid of superstition, and the temple is the only building of importance in the history of the art. In Imperial Rome the art was the costly plaything of sensual autocrats, though with that occasional pretence of public spirit often displayed under such circumstances; and the great Baths built by some of the emperors form perhaps the only examples of grand buildings dedicated to the advantage of the community at large. The Indian peninsula is strewn with temples erected in honour of the grotesque or obscene deities for whom these richly but uncouthly decorated shrines seem fitting habitations; the Mussulman conquerors, who transformed the Hindoo temples into mosques, beautified the country with the splendid tombs of themselves and their relatives; and the Taj Mahal, the central gem of Indian Saracenic art, is the extravagant whim of an uxorious despot, carried out by the forced labour of slaves.¹ The great mediæval churches of Europe, which

(1) It is a curious freak of architectural history, that the nearest parallel to this last-named work, so far as origin and motive are concerned, should be found (under such different social and political conditions) in the gew-gaw erection, with its gilt gingerbread decoration, which stands at Kensington. The parallel ends here, it must be admitted. Whatever the possible virtues of the Indian lady commemorated by the Taj Mahal, she received as adequate and beautiful a memorial of them as architecture could furnish; while it is to the credit of the late Prince Consort to say that nothing could be more out of keeping with his character than the piece of architectural tawdriness erected as a tribute to his memory.

form, in their union of logical construction with rich and picturesque effect, the loftiest achievements of the architect, arose in obedience to the aspirations of an ambitious and domineering religious caste, backed more or less by that regal power which (with a keen instinct as to their common interests) has so frequently played into the hands of the priesthood; and the funds for these great works were obtained by a spiritual despotism perfectly effective in its results, whether exercised publicly on a large scale, or privately in those house-to-house visitations pictured in Chaucer's tale, where the friar, having driven the cat off the most comfortable chair, seats himself by the sick man's bedside to remark that—

“By God, we owen fortie pound for stones.”

In all these instances, which include the greatest monuments of the architecture of the past, we see the art practised for the delight or glorification of the few at the expense of the many—always the work of a privileged caste of one description or another, and generally, in its finest forms, practised in honour of “the gods” or of “religion.”

It is scarcely necessary to point out to any educated reader now, that architecture, since the rise of the modern or rationalistic period, has been practised on an essentially different basis from that which governed all the great styles of the past. It has been not the spontaneous and natural development of style from originating constructive conditions, but the arbitrary selection of this or that style of the past as in itself the most admirable, and therefore to be used as a model for imitation. The radical distinction between this post-Renaissance architecture and all that preceded it has been familiarised to general readers by the works of M. Viollet-le-Duc in France and of Mr. Fergusson in England, who have long laboured, the first as a practical architect and archæologist, the second as a theoretic critic, to show the essential falsity of the modern system. In the architecture of the Italian Renaissance, indeed, the style of the Romans (itself an adaptation or corruption of the Greek) was used in a manner which realised a new and original expression, though involving an æsthetic falsity (to be touched upon just now); a manner which we adopted in what may be termed the Wren period, with the loss, however, of much of its refinement. But in the more recent period of the English revival, temples were adopted wholesale and in their complete form to serve as churches, as markets, as town-halls, as almost everything; under the idea that the Greek temple being the perfection of the art, and incapable of improvement, we could not do better than reproduce it. The practical inconveniences resulting from the adoption of forms of building intended for different purposes and for a different climate,

as well as the ineffectiveness of a southern style in a northern atmosphere, could not but soon force themselves into notice; and the recognition of these incompatibilities perhaps had a good deal to do, in conjunction with other less easily estimated influences, in bringing about the mediæval revival, part of the cry of its votaries being for our indigenous and "Christian" style. It is now ebb-tide with the mediæval revival; but its effects remain, and may for some time remain, involving anachronisms which have more than a merely architectural influence, and the incongruity of which is hardly appreciated as yet, while they tend at the same time to obscure the perception of the essential excellence of mediæval architecture, and of its significance as a subject for study and suggestion in relation to the development of modern architecture.

Mediæval art and architecture are in fact regarded at present, by those who seem to concern themselves most with the subject, through a highly coloured medium of semi-religious sentimentalism. Nor is it surprising that such noble structures as our cathedrals, additionally hallowed by their association with the past, should stir such a feeling among the weaker brethren, when even clear-headed and practical philosophers confess to a love for crawling, though "in a molluscous fashion," about their precincts, and commit themselves to indiscretions about "traceries." It is difficult, no doubt, when contemplating the weather-stained and venerable features of these monuments, about which an atmosphere of calm and forgetfulness seems to hover (I speak, of course, of those which have as yet escaped the voracity of the restorer), and which appear to contrast our bustling and noisy days with the quiet we attribute to the olden time, to realise the fact that these structures had a totally different aspect and association when new or in progress. True that they were ostensibly erected to "the glory of God;" true also that they exhibited, so far as the actual cathedral building was concerned, a supremacy of the artistic over the merely utilitarian elements of building such as is rarely attained in the present day, or in structures which are not the productions of a caste. But, in fact, the spirit of rivalry which prompted one conventual establishment to outvie another in the splendour of its buildings, was as natural an outbreak of what is called healthy antagonism as that which leads two provincial towns to endeavour to out-do each other in the costliness and extent of their town-halls or exchanges. The construction of the stone vault, which was the great glory of the mediæval builders, and about which so many rhymesters have rhymed (not to speak of one or two poets), was a very practical matter indeed, involving knotty problems of stone-cutting and balance of pressures, and arising out of no sentimental feeling about "embowed roofs," but out of the logical endeavour to bring the original Roman round vault into harmony with the conditions of

design and construction in the more complex Gothic building. So little of the modern sentiment had the mediæval builders, that they thought no more of removing and obliterating the work of a previous generation of architects, and replacing it by a new building in the style they had themselves arrived at, than a modern engineer would think of removing an old bridge, constructed on an antiquated principle, to replace it by an improved modern one. The conventual buildings in connection with the church (and they formed a far more important part, even architecturally speaking, of the entire group than most spectators of their dilapidated vestiges at all realise) were arranged and planned on a scheme just as practical and matter-of-fact, in proportion to the sanitary knowledge and social habits of the time, as that of a modern hotel—the place of which, indeed, as the reader need hardly be reminded, the mediæval convent with its *hospitium* to a considerable extent fulfilled.

There was, in short, no glamour about mediæval architecture during the course of its production and elaboration; the glamour is only projected upon it in the phantasmagoria of modern enthusiasts. Those who have traced the constructive history of the leading features of Gothic architecture, know that no more in this than in any other logically developed architectural style are its characteristic features invented all at once in a fervour of sentimental aspiration; that buttress, vault, and pinnacle (and even in most cases the smaller ornamental details) are the results of long and often-repeated efforts to realise, first, the most practically sound use and application of the materials in meeting the difficulties of construction, and, secondly (or one should rather say simultaneously), the most effective disposition and decorative treatment of those materials consistent with a strictly observed relation to their practical object:—to combine, in other words, a homogeneous and logical construction with an equally homogeneous and logical, but at the same time forcible and piquant, expression of that construction, in which combination, speaking broadly, architecture in its highest and severest form really consists. In the great church which formed the crowning feature of the convent buildings, we come upon what may be called the poetry of architecture, in which the utilitarian element becomes entirely subordinate; but even from this point of view the purely architectural logic of those buildings, and their beauty and fitness of detail, constitute their essential interest, quite apart from the halo of sentiment which has been thrown round them, and of which their builders probably felt little or nothing. Our cathedrals, in short, owe their existence to the ambition and rivalry of powerful religious communities,¹ and their completeness and unity of architectural style to the

(1) A striking instance of the kind of way in which this spirit of rivalry operated, exists in the grand west front of Peterborough Cathedral, which appears to have been entirely

genius of bold and aspiring builders, working out the constructive and artistic problem that came into their hands, with a steadiness and continuity of progress which, in these days of distracted artistic aims, seems almost like an intuition.

The architectural style that was developed by the mediæval builders had, like every art, its history of rise, and culmination, and decline. As long as an art is a living art, and expressing the genuine sympathies and aspirations of men, it can never be a stationary one: it always aspires, it never looks back. But, as in the case of a living organism, this very vitality includes the presage of ultimate decay and extinction. The succeeding generations of mediæval builders gained one point after another in the completion of the constructive design of their buildings, refined and refined upon the originally broad and pure decorative characteristics of the style, always with a new, though a fading, grace and luxuriance, till at last its extreme capabilities were exhausted, and it simply went out—died of old age; and almost simultaneously died the social motive and spirit which had been its occasion of existence. That time of change came, the significance of which Mr. Froude has so pathetically expressed:—

“The paths trodden by the footsteps of ages were broken up; old things were passing away, and the faith and life of ten centuries were dissolving like a dream. Chivalry was dying; the Abbey and the Castle were soon together to crumble into ruins, and all the forms, desires, beliefs, convictions of the old world were passing away, never to return. . . . In the fabric of habit in which they had so laboriously built for themselves, mankind were to remain no longer.

“And now it is all gone—like an insubstantial pageant faded; and between us and the old English there lies a gulf of mystery which the prose of the historian will never adequately bridge. They cannot come to us, and our imagination can but feebly penetrate to them. Only among the aisles of the Cathedrals, only as we gaze upon their silent figures sleeping on their tombs, some faint conceptions float before us of what these men were when they were alive; and perhaps in the sound of church bells, that peculiar creation of the mediæval age, which falls upon the ear like the echo of a vanished world.”

an afterthought to cut out the builders of Ely, who, after the commencement of the Peterborough west end as originally intended, started their own west front to out-do the Peterborough establishment, and thus spurred on the latter to the erection of their grand portico, with its three great arches the whole height of the front, to throw the Ely folk into the shade again. The rivalry had an earlier stage also, when the Peterborough nave was extended in response to a previous challenge from Ely, the variations in the style and details fixing the relative dates indubitably. The real significance of these rapid changes and extensions of plan was, I believe, first brought out by Mr. Edmund Sharpe (author of “Architectural Parallels,” &c., &c.), whose services to all students of architecture, in the elucidation and illustration of the great mediæval buildings, from the architectural and not from the clerical or sentimental point of view, can hardly be overestimated.

It is impossible to avoid noticing how essentially similar is this rivalry of the mediæval convents in their structures to that of modern railway companies; each company that builds a new terminus endeavouring to have a bigger and grander hotel in front than any other, and a station roof of wider span.

But, while the soul had thus departed of mediæval life, the body, the building, remained; and a very important element it is in the part that architecture plays in its relation to modern life especially, that its productions have this *quasi*-permanent character, and cannot be put aside and forgotten like a picture or a book which appeals to tastes that have become antiquated. There the cathedrals stand, memorials and landmarks of what were once the main centres of English life, witnesses of a spiritual despotism whose staff has been long since broken; records, too, of strenuous healthy labour and ingenuity applied, with no haphazard or wavering aim, towards the translation of brute material into an organic expression of stability and grace and aspiration, which still commands our sympathy and admiration. And no man who understands in what the art of architecture in its higher forms consists, none who have an interest in the past history, intellectual and social, of their native country, would for a moment undervalue these monuments at once of a great period of architectural art and of an extinct phase of national life, or grudge any care or reasonable cost bestowed on their preservation. But it is quite another thing to imagine that the feeling, artistic or moral, out of which they sprung, can be artificially revived, and the mediæval cathedral galvanised into life again. This, however, is a prevalent idea with a number of well-meaning people of the *dilettante* order; and one writer, who is a fair specimen of the educated Philistine, has put forth a formal plea in favour of "The Cathedral of the Nineteenth Century." Now, do these good people really imagine that they can revivify the mediæval cathedral, either architecturally or in its supposed moralising influences, unless they can first restore the condition of art, and of thought, and of society under which the originals arose? Their cathedral of the nineteenth century would simply be a huge mediæval toy, and a toy which could not be put out of sight or otherwise disposed of when the partial cry for it had subsided. Enough of this has been done on a smaller scale already to leave to our descendants a very remarkable legacy of architectural curiosities. Under the influence of a kind of ecclesiastical or ecclesiological revival, which cannot in the nature of things be permanent, the country has been covered with churches, in designing which the avowed intention has been to mimic, to reproduce as far as possible, the architectural detail and arrangement of mediæval churches—a mimicry which has been known to be carried out so completely as to deceive (if it were possible) even the elect, when the work had become somewhat weather-stained, into a belief in its genuine antiquity—happy culmination of the labour of a lifetime. In the majority of cases, however, the imitation has been tasteless, feeble, and entirely missing the spirit of genuine mediæval work; and, what is in a practical sense more serious, these buildings are utterly useless for

anything except ecclesiological church services, and, are in fact quite unfitted even for the public worship of the church as generally celebrated at present, except on merely sentimental grounds: the whole thing is a kind of *Joseph Surface* architecture, consisting entirely of "sentiment." What will be the ultimate fate of all these structures, when the ecclesiastical mania subsides, might form a curious subject of speculation.

On the other hand, the influence exercised by the existing cathedrals, as the centres of church architecture, is noticeable. It is not improbable, though it would be difficult no doubt to prove, that the mere existence of these great buildings, the legacies of the conventual period, is in a great degree accountable for the ecclesiological revival we have recently witnessed. The buildings are great facts, recalling and illustrating the power of the mediæval church, and moreover they are structures which no one would willingly let die, while at the same time they seem too large and important buildings to be left standing without being put to some practical use. This last consideration has been really and openly operative in bringing into fashion the popular services and the choral and other celebrations whereby the naves of our cathedrals are now beginning to be "utilised." The effect upon the clergy of the possession or custody of these buildings is rather amusing. Because the cathedrals were the creations originally of a powerful clergy, their present tenants and custodians seem to imagine that they wield the same sort of social and political power in their generation; as if matters were unchanged as long as the material building was unshaken. The fact that the cathedrals, the highest achievements of English architecture, were built under the instigation of a clerical caste, seems to beget also in the modern cathedral cleric an odd sort of idea that the architectural mantle of the original founders has descended upon him—that he is by the fact of his cathedral connection an authority and a light on the subject of architecture generally. The relation of the clergy to church architecture is, however, a question of some public importance in regard to the conservation of the cathedrals. Whatever be the legal position of the matter (which the present writer has no qualification for discussing), there can be no doubt that morally the cathedrals are the property of the nation, as national, historical, and architectural monuments, rather than of the Church as it now exists. When they were built, the Church which founded them was the great intellectual, social, and in many respects political power in the land. The Church of the present day is, in regard to the great affairs of the nation, and to modern intellectual life generally, of the nature of a dummy; and we have a right to look with some jealousy on the interference with the integrity and reality of some of the cathedrals, carried on under the

name of restoration, and with the sanction and encouragement of the clergy. Whatever is necessary to preserve the structures from falling into decay should be done; but matters are carried much further than this, and the interest and true history of some of the cathedrals have already been almost entirely obliterated by wholesale renovations, evidently carried out in no mere conservative spirit (whatever may be pretended), but from a desire for the *éclat* attendant upon the proceeding, and a wish to give a sort of new birth to a church foundation—providing a whited sepulchre where there is nothing but a defunct body within. What is thus destroyed or overlaid is what no possible power can restore; once gone, the old architectural work is gone for ever; and it is really time that something should be done to prevent the chance of the whole of our greatest architectural monuments being turned into new modern-mediæval buildings, under pretence of preserving them. If Sir John Lubbock, who takes so much interest in the preservation of older historic monuments, would bring in a bill to prevent deans and their architects from doing what they please with those equally important national possessions, the cathedrals, he would be doing a good service, and would earn the thanks of many who see with deep regret that substitution of new copies for the old realities, by which the genuine interest of our great historic buildings is being destroyed.

That the mediæval revival, notwithstanding the impulse which it has unquestionably given to the study of architecture, and even, in a degree, to the cultivation of public taste in regard to building, has been found wanting—that there is no real life in it, as hitherto practised, for the development of modern architecture—has recently become pretty evident even to many of its warmest supporters. The various receipts which have been propounded for putting life into it, and making it a reality, afford curious evidence of the doubt and confusion of feeling on the subject. One theory is that the study of the higher arts of design, the power of drawing the figure and of designing sculpture for his building, would raise the architect once more to the true height of his art. Considering what is the nature of the figure drawing and sculpture in the windows and niches of the Gothic cathedrals, in regard to technical power of drawing and design, it must be pretty evident that it is not upon these adjuncts that their effect depends; just as, on the other hand, it is equally evident that his splendid power of designing the figure did not preserve such a genius as Michelangelo from the most flagrant sins against architectural logic and good taste even in St. Peter's, and still more in his earlier architectural attempts. Moreover, as it is apparent that even a sole and lifelong devotion to the arts of painting or sculpture only enables a few men to produce anything beyond mediocrity, and as the architect necessarily could not give the same

time and study to these arts, it is difficult to see what would be gained by all our architects turning themselves into mediocre sculptors and painters. Another receipt, given with even greater confidence, is in entire opposition to this. Because the word "architect" nowhere occurs in the records of the mediæval buildings, nor anything which can be positively said to be its precise equivalent, it is assumed that these great structures arose of themselves, as it were, by a kind of unanimous impulse among workmen, having no chief instructor, and working upon no preconcerted plan. The inference, of course, is obvious: take away the architect, forbid the making of any preliminary drawings, turn loose a band of "inspired workmen" upon the site, and the building will "rise like an exhalation," and repeat all the glory of mediæval architecture in the most natural and simple manner. This, which has been termed the "inspired workman theory," was promulgated in its most uncompromising form by an "inspired" writer in the *Quarterly Review*, whose utterly rabid and revolutionary sentiments formed at least a laughable contrast to the habitual tone of that publication. Mr. Fergusson, who is, of course, entitled to a respectful hearing, has taken up a line of argument very similar to this, though put in a more moderate manner. The following passage, in which he instances the Crystal Palace as a building carried out in the same spirit as the mediæval cathedrals, is worth quotation as a typical statement of his case:—

"No material is used in it (the Crystal Palace) which is not the best for its purpose, no constructive expedient employed which was not absolutely essential, and it depends wholly for its effect on the arrangement of its parts and the display of its construction. So essentially is its principle the same which, as we have seen, animated Gothic architecture, that we hardly know even now how much of the design belongs to Sir Joseph Paxton, how much to the contractors, or how much to the subordinate officers employed by the Company."

In that case the bust of Paxton on the terrace at Sydenham ought to be surrounded by a crowd of little busts, down to the men who put the rivets in. But our ignorance as to who really designed the building, if it be granted, does not prove that it designed itself. It was, moreover, a structure built in a hurry and against time; and, as Mr. Fergusson himself observes, architecture will not be revived by buildings so essentially ephemeral as this. Nor, even if we accept the theory of the spontaneous generation of the mediæval cathedrals, could we by any possibility revive, since the advent of the printing-press and the locomotive, the state of intellectual and artistic naïveté which such a theory presupposes.

The real mistake at the root of modern architecture is the sentimental archæology which seems to have absolutely taken possession of it, and of which Mr. Fergusson's receipt itself partakes, since it in reality only suggests that by going back to the supposed habits

of a former age we can produce what the present age wants. Even the engineers (who in some ways stand, more nearly than any other body of men, in the same position in regard to the present day as the mediæval masons did to their own time) are bitten by this; and when they wish to make a structure "ornamental," they have no idea but to dress it in some borrowed plumes of classic or mediæval architecture. The influence of sentiment has been exhibited in a still more curious manner in a recent great building, the Albert Hall. This, which is the design of engineers, is a rather remarkable building, and exhibits some of the characteristics of a work constructed on genuine architectural principles. The details are coarse and commonplace, for it seems impossible to beat into the head of an engineer that some training and education of the eye and the judgment is necessary for the production of suitable and refined ornamental detail; but plan, construction, and design form a united and interdependent whole, arising as they do in a strictly logical manner one out of the other. The unfortunate point is that the plan is utterly wrong, to begin with, for the purpose of the building; and it is so entirely from the sentimental worship of precedent which led the designer, instead of considering what was the best plan for the purpose, to start with the idea of reproducing the Roman amphitheatre, although a moment's consideration ought to have rendered it evident, as a mere matter of ordinary common sense, that the plan of a building for seating people round a circumference to witness a spectacle in the centre, could by no possibility furnish the proper model for one in which they were to listen to music performed at one end of the building. But it is to such incongruities that people are led through forgetting that architecture is not (except in very rare instances) a pure art, governed by æsthetic or sentimental considerations; that it is the artistic or effective expression of practical requirements which must govern and form the basis of the whole. It is in further emphasizing this condition of architecture that the possibility of making it a genuine intellectual pursuit, and not a mere toy, really consists.

After what has been said above about receipts, it will not be supposed that there is any intention here of offering another new and infallible one; but it is possible to point to modern examples in which this treatment of architectural effect on a practical basis has been so far realised as to indicate at least a direction in which the art may receive a new development. There is a large building at present in progress—the new Town Hall in Manchester—the internal plan and arrangement of which affords an admirable instance of novel and picturesque effect, obtained simply as the natural result of the masterly and complete manner in which the very intricate internal economy of a great hive of multifarious departments is reduced to simplicity and order.

The exterior of Mr. Waterhouse's building, it must be admitted, belongs to the sentimental school of architecture; it has no very close or necessary connection with the internal plan; it is thought picturesque at present, and may or may not be thought so under future changes of taste; but the treatment of the interior will command admiration always, because its excellence is of a kind which is practical as well as picturesque, and is independent of mere changes in architectural fashion. The same sort of excellence, on a grander scale, is exemplified in the Houses of Parliament, which the designers of the Albert-Hall will probably be surprised to be told is, in its main scheme, much more practical, as well as more beautiful, piece of architecture than their building. It is so unquestionably; its plan is a most effective and yet perfectly simple and practical expression of the objects of the various parts of the building and their relation to one another, and all the principal features of the exterior design arise out of, and emphasize, the leading points of the plan. The "style" of the Houses of Parliament is an utter mistake; it was the deliberate selection for imitation of a bad and weak phase of late mediæval architecture. But for this its architect was not responsible; and when a building fulfils the conditions of practical, and at the same time effective, grouping and construction, the details are of secondary consequence. The question of plan is more especially the basis of modern architecture on a large scale, because most large modern buildings are far more intricate in their purposes and requirements than was the case with ancient buildings, of which the larger ones were, as already observed, mostly temples, consisting principally of one great apartment, and presenting accordingly a far more simple and straightforward, and also a more purely æsthetic, problem than modern structures of the same dimensions.

But if architecture always has required and must require edifices on a great scale, and rising more or less beyond utilitarian objects, for her greatest effects, is there not also something to be done on a less ambitious scale—something, nevertheless, equally important, and which, having scarcely as yet received any adequate attention, presents a good deal of the suggestiveness always accompanying a new problem? It is only within the last century or so that we have had what may be called an architecture of the people—a style of the many, a vernacular of building, the results of which we see in those miles upon miles of dull brick walls with oblong holes in them which form the lining of the streets of London and of most of our large towns. This style was developed first when English architecture, after the decease of the Gothic spirit, had sunk through various grades of pseudo-classicism to the primness of the square brick architecture and round knobs of the Queen Anne period, which only required to have its few decorative features shorn off to

make a serviceable general builder's style for flanking the streets of towns, while separate slices of it were stuck about the land as country houses. The weight which these dreary acres of brick lay upon our daily lives is perhaps hardly felt or recognised, because we have come to accept it as the normal state of things. There are signs, however, of a growing dissatisfaction with the present state of town architecture, and a possibility of that demand for something better arising which must necessarily precede the supply; and any amelioration of street architecture must also follow the law of modern architectural design, and commence first from the basis of practical considerations. The sanitary conditions of life in large towns, as affecting the arrangement and construction of dwellings, form, or should form, a very important element in influencing the town architecture of the future. The increasing value of building-sites, and the simultaneous increase of population, suggest new expedients in the method of building town houses, such as the introduction of the Paris system of houses "in flats," which has been a good deal talked about and even tried in London, but not as yet in an adequate manner. Such a system, if adopted at all extensively, would, however, exercise a very important influence on street architecture by rendering almost necessary, and at the same time facilitating, in an economical point of view, the employment of a far more solid and sounder construction, and affording opportunity for realising a higher architectural character than has ever hitherto been attained in this department of building in England. Something like this system has also been a good deal employed in carrying out the excellent work of providing healthy homes for the poorer inhabitants of towns at rents commensurate with their means. It must, however, be matter for regret to observe how little the possibility of rendering these model homes attractive in appearance, as well as sanitary in arrangement, is considered. Nothing could well be more unhome-like, nothing more repellent to the eye, or devoid of every gracious and pleasing association, than the aspect of some of these stacks of building in various towns in which families are to make their homes. Surely some effort may be made to give them a more attractive and picturesque, a less mill-like, appearance—to give some characteristic variety also to the various tenements, instead of their "damnable iteration" of the same arrangement of doors and windows in so many rows. This is considered, I am well aware, to be simply a question of remunerative return; but ought it to be entirely so? Or is there not, even on public grounds, some sort of return to be considered and thought of besides that of so much per cent.?

Architecture, however, is an art, though an art involved with, and mostly arising out of, practical and scientific problems; and if we come to consider what sort of form the hoped-for development of our

town architecture, either in great buildings or in streets, should take, it is here that the study of our mediæval architecture comes in as an inspiration. There are two species of architectural art: that which ornaments the exterior of a building with a kind of screen or scenic design of features arbitrarily selected for their supposed elegance, but having no direct connection with the plan and construction of the building; and that in which the constructive design is itself the foundation of the architectural effect and expression, and is merely decorated so far, and in such a way, as to give relief and emphasis to this constructive expression; any decoration which does not conduce to this being, in fact, beside the mark and an excrescence. Of the first-named species the most familiar type is that which is called Italian, having been evolved by the Italian architects of the Renaissance, and consisting of an application of some of the principal features of Greek and Roman architecture (pilasters, columns, small pediments, &c.) to the exterior of a building by way of ornament. This style arose under the influence of that classic revival in literature which led to the exclusive worship of "the antique" as the only source of true culture; and it is remarkable how this *prestige* has clung to the style, insomuch that, until very recently, when any question of architectural style in connection with some public building came before the legislature, it was almost invariably the case that the Liberal party were in favour of a classic style, supposing it to be essentially connected with progress and culture, and the Conservatives hoisted the Gothic colours, as the champions of the past and of mediævalism. Both sides were about equally in the wrong. Without denying that very pleasing and very elegant buildings—compositions they may be called—have been created on the Renaissance principle; without saying that there may not be occasions and circumstances under which it may be fitly employed in a purely decorative architecture (though it would be difficult perhaps to name them), it is evident that architectural design, as thus employed, is little more than a toy, with no more real relation to the practical basis of building than is to be found in the imitative mediæval churches before referred to.

For the principle of all real and true architecture is the same—a decorative treatment based upon and emphasizing the plan and construction of the building; and in this point of view the Greek and the Gothic are the two truest and most perfect styles of the world, the only essential distinction between them being that the Greek works out with perfect completeness and unity of expression a trabeated construction, and the Goth works out with equal completeness an arcuated construction. In all that constitutes the essence of architectural style, Salisbury Cathedral and the Sainte Chapelle have far more affinity with the Parthenon, than have the

artificial constructions of Palladio and Vignola. And Greek architecture, in its refined and reticent beauty, is full of suggestion for the modern architect; supplying, it may perhaps be said, the element demanded by modern culture and civilisation, while the study of Gothic supplies the element of strength and reality which has been so long absent from our architecture, and which is to be acquired not by copying and imitating mediæval forms, but by cultivating a sympathy with the method and feeling of that grand and masculine school of architecture, and thereby acquiring the power of giving to the new practical forms of modern building their appropriate and picturesque expression, arising from the truthful treatment of materials and construction rather than from applied or misapplied ornament. Reticence in this last respect is one of the lessons we need most, in regard to London architecture especially. There is often more so-called "ornament" on one railway hotel than would be found on half-a-dozen cathedrals of the greatest age of mediæval art; and the principle has yet to be learned by most of our architects, that every ornamental detail which does not assist the expression of a building injures it.

It is remarkable how very little has really been made, amid all the bustle of architectural revival in recent years, of the higher class of dwelling-houses as opportunities for something of what may be called the poetry of architecture. "Handsome" houses, and more lately "picturesque" houses, have no doubt been built by scores; but they seem to go very much on prevailing patterns which succeed one another, like the fashions in dress, for no particular reason. The old notion of the typical English gentleman used to be that it was vulgar to have a house which differed materially or in any striking way from that of your neighbours. Surely it is that idea itself which rather deserves the epithet vulgar, even in the literal sense of the word. A great deal that is charming, a great deal of what constitutes the picturesque of life, might be realised in the interiors, especially, of the higher class of dwellings, if they were made the opportunity for the exercise of original thought and individual taste and feeling in their arrangement and decoration, instead of being so mechanically contrived on habitual and accepted schemes.

There has no doubt been a great advance in good taste as to house furniture and fittings of late years; and the monstrosities which used to crowd the windows of cabinet-makers would be scouted now. But a good deal of this, it must be confessed, is nothing more than another revival. A recent turn of popular thought has led to a kind of resuscitation of the art of what Tennyson rather happily calls the "tea-cup times." So far as architecture is concerned, this revival of the Queen Anne style seems the most rubbishy and contemptible of all, since there is not even the excuse of an inherent

grandeur in the style; it is the last lingering debasement of Renaissance architecture, the corruption of a corruption. The style of decorative art which belongs to it has a certain fitness and suitability to recommend it for interiors, though it is anything but intellectual, and is followed more as a matter of fashion than of deliberate opinion; indeed, it is impossible to avoid a disagreeable conviction of the imposture pervading the present mania for æsthetic fittings, Japanese jars and old china, and Queen Anne furniture and costumes; a mania which is carried so far that, as those who know anything of the ways of these disciples of the æsthetic must be aware, the joke in *Punch* about the gentleman who preferred the shorter of two sisters for a wife to the taller, because "she would go better with my style of furniture—buhl and marqueterie, you know"—is scarcely an exaggeration of literal fact. There is something contemptible in this exaltation of the mere decoration of life (a sham decoration, too) above the reality; and something quite apart from real artistic feeling, than which, in its true sense, nothing can harmonise better with that "plain living and high thinking," the decay of which was so feelingly deplored by Wordsworth, and from which we seem so very, very far at present.

Once more: architecture in its most important manifestations is directly connected with public as well as private life, and to recommend itself to the predominant public opinion of the day, to be in harmony with the real tendency of modern political life, it must cast itself loose from the sentimental prejudices which would connect it only with the old order of things, and study to reach forward to those things which are before. It is unfortunate that the leading members of the profession at present seem to be almost entirely neglectful to discern the signs of the times, and to be connected by their sympathies and associations with what by most thinking men are regarded as outworn conditions of life and opinion. The influence of this upon architecture is being illustrated in the carrying out of the largest and most costly public building of the day. There can be nothing unkind or unfair in saying of Mr. Street, who is entrusted with the building of the new Law Courts, what he has himself repeatedly and publicly professed that he is entirely bound, by conviction and sympathy, to an absolute belief in the dogmas, the sentiment, and the artistic practice and ritual of the mediæval Church. The result of this is, that the new Law Courts are being clothed in a mediæval garb of the most uncompromising type, reproducing the ancient cathedral style even to the niches for the statues of saints, perhaps to be filled in this case (in a sufficiently different manner) by those of great legal lights. That there will be a certain power and grandeur in the building when complete there can be little doubt, for no living English architect has more the faculty of putting

the impress of power on his work; and he has built churches of which it may be said (what can hardly be said of any other modern-mediæval work) that they have the real feeling and force of original mediæval architecture without being literal copies. But it is to be feared that this great building, whatever merits in detail it may have (and they ought to be great, since it has ousted a design confessedly superior in plan), will remain to future generations as a piece of false architectural sentiment, entirely contradictory of the real intellectual history of this century.

But a far more serious instance of this false sentiment has been seen in the recent proposal for decorating St. Paul's Cathedral. Those who are not aware of the extent to which modern architectural practice is combined with the worship of all sorts of superstitions, would perhaps scarcely credit the fact that the most important and costly portion of this scheme, estimated at about half a million, as drawn out by the architect engaged by the committee (against whose ability as an artist not a word is here hinted), was to consist of mosaic decorations representing not only prophets, apostles, and angels (with gold plates behind their heads), but the whole tag-rag and bob-tail of apocryphal church saints with their legendary symbols; and this, the only cathedral which is in some degree associated, and was intended by its architect to be associated, with the new intellectual life of the modern period,¹ was thus to be made a receptacle for all the ecclesiological lumber of past ages. What sort of laughing-stock the thing would have been, as time went on, if this absurd and barbarous puerility had really been stereotyped in imperishable material, may well be imagined by those whose brains are not addled. The very proposition of such a scheme adds force to what was said above as to the necessity of having some governmental control over the treatment of buildings which are, morally speaking, the interest and property of the whole nation. On the other hand, the normal attitude of our Government towards public works of architecture is far too grudging and illiberal. It is with the greatest difficulty that small grants can be extracted for the pursuance, for instance, of important archæological investigations in different parts of the world—a matter in which France has, in not a few instances, set our statesmen a noble example. And I remember taking note of a debate in regard to the expenditure of money on the architectural embellishment of the Law Courts, in which every speaker (even among those who habitually figure as "patrons" of art) who ventured to lift up his voice in favour of a liberal treatment

(1) It is scarcely necessary to remind the reader that Wren's original plan was for a wide central area, as most appropriate for the "reformed worship," and that he was deeply chagrined at being compelled, by court influence, to adopt the old mediæval or processional plan.

of the building, did so in the most amusingly humble and apologetic manner, and amid profuse professions of his wish to consider the subject "entirely from a practical point of view"—as if any expenditure of public money on mere art were something to be ashamed of. Members of Parliament, however, will be quite ready to take a different view of these things when they know that their constituents expect it from them. It is to the development of a higher standard of culture and refinement among the middle and lower classes that we must look to supply that stimulus to architecture which it formerly owed to the taste or ambition of aristocratic castes. Perhaps, in turn, it may not unreasonably be demanded of the architectural profession that they should show a higher and more unselfish spirit of devotion to their calling in its noblest aspect than is often seen; a less conspicuous readiness to undertake, for mere lucre, multifarious commissions which can only be carried out mechanically and by proxy: another matter which they manage better in France, as the lives of some eminent French architects do most honourably testify. Nor must it be forgotten that the moral tone of a nation has a most appreciable influence upon its architecture, which always, in a certain sense, reflects a portion of the spirit of the times. It is because a number of persons worship ecclesiastical shams that the country is covered with mock-mediaeval churches. It is because speculating builders are destitute of common honesty that an immense proportion of our dwellings are ugly, rickety, and unhealthy; and that the clumsy machinery of Building Acts (presses to squeeze the life and individuality out of city architecture) is necessary to ensure the most ordinary attention to proper sanitary and constructive conditions. It is because success in trade is based on ostentation and puffing rather than on honourable dealing, that our shop architecture stands upon sheets of plate-glass, and is bedizened with wooden and "compo" pilasters and cornices. Only as our national life itself becomes more true and healthful in tone, can we hope to realise the conditions under which a modern architecture may arise, no longer the expression of mere archæological sentiment, or of the partial sympathies of a religious, a social, or an æsthetic clique, but the endeavour after a more truthful and beautiful framework to their daily life on the part of the people at large.

H. H. STATHAM.

THE AMERICAN CENTENARY.

THE hundredth anniversary of American independence was celebrated in a becoming manner, but rather in the way of a duty to be performed, or an extensive business transaction, than as a civic festival. The fourth of July will long continue to be a national holiday, but during the past quarter of a century there has been a growing tendency to look upon it as a necessary evil, and to regard the orator of the day in the light of a bore. The racket of gunpowder and the broiling procession with their attendant casualties are a pretty severe strain upon all except juvenile patriotism. Declamation against the evil practices of George III. ceased to find any real echo in America after they ceased to find any defenders in England. What remains is a deep reverence for the soldiers and statesmen of the revolutionary period. This is sufficient to give permanence to the national anniversary, and it is to be hoped it may never grow less. •

What sort of political development has been worked out by the United States during the century now past, is a question susceptible of more than one answer. Taken in its broadest sense, however, it would appear to be that whereas certain British colonies, independent of each other, did unite together a hundred years ago for the purpose of resisting unjust measures on the part of the mother country, they have employed the intervening time, down to the year 1865, in getting rid of colonial traditions, prejudices, and encumbrances, and becoming consolidated as a nation. He who sees in the war of the rebellion only a struggle between slavery and freedom, sees but a part of the issues involved, and ignores the largest chapter of American history. He who sees in it only a strife for dominion on the one side and independence on the other, takes an equally narrow and one-sided view. The struggle between state sovereignty and national sovereignty commenced immediately upon the conclusion of peace with Great Britain, and continued without intermission down to the overthrow of the rebellion, but the only element capable, according to human ken, of bringing it to the arbitrament of arms was African slavery. On the other hand, it is highly improbable that the slaveholding States would have resorted to arms if they had not been educated during three generations to believe that they had a constitutional right to nullify the acts of the general government, or, as the late President Lincoln termed it, "a constitutional right to overturn the constitution."

The recent work of Professor Von Holst, now accessible in

English,¹ throws a strong and steady light upon the conflict of ideas which divided parties, sections, and states from the adoption of the constitution down to a very recent period. Although this conflict has seldom been out of the mouths of statesmen, although it has filled more printed pages and newspaper columns than any other question, it was reserved for a foreign writer to trace the windings of the stream from its fountain head, through the thickets and quicksands of near a hundred years, to its *débouchement* in the war of the rebellion. The bird's-eye view is best obtained from the distance, and when, as in the present case, the author has made preparations for his survey by long and careful study on the ground itself, we are not surprised to find things brought to view which had been obscured to Americans by their very nearness. A completeness and roundness are also given to the whole which has hitherto been wanting, and which are worthy of the highest praise. A Swiss lawyer gave the first finished exposition of the English Constitution, and a French philosopher the most perspicuous treatise on Democracy in America; and now we are indebted to a German professor for the most comprehensive work on the political development of the United States.

The point from which this development is to be traced is the colonial period, in which we find thirteen communities dependent upon Great Britain, and more attached to her than to each other, reluctantly compelled to draw the sword in defence of the dearest rights of freemen. Some sort of union was necessary to make the resistance effectual; and when the colonies came together in consultation very crude notions prevailed as to their legal status. A few men even then perceived the incongruity of a dual sovereignty—that of the State and of the United States—but the great majority, both of leaders and led, assumed as a fact that the declaration of independence, although not the act of any colony by itself, nor yet of all the colonies separately, but the act of all in unison, had had the effect to make them each sovereign; and in this frame of mind they proceeded to construct the loose political harness called the Confederation, a thing of shreds and patches which with difficulty held together during the war, and which, after peace had been declared, became the laughing-stock of foreign governments, the winding-sheet of the public credit, and the execration of George Washington. Although the title of this document was Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union, the sovereignty of the States was expressly declared, and the powers of the Confederation were so extremely

(1) "The Constitutional History of the United States," by Dr. H. Von Holst, Professor at the University of Freiburg. Translated from the German by John J. Lalor and Alfred B. Mason. Vol. I., *State Sovereignty and Slavery*. Chicago: Callaghan & Co. 1876.

attenuated that no money could be raised by taxation, direct or indirect, except by assessment upon the States, which they could pay or not as they pleased. The war had left the Confederation heavily in debt. Various devices were resorted to for obtaining the means to meet the maturing obligations of the Government. A multitude of 'set-offs and excuses' were offered by the little sovereignties in place of cash, and, of course, the more honourable among them would not continue to pay if the less honourable continued to shirk. Assessments having failed to accomplish anything, it was proposed to ask the States to allow the general government to collect taxes within their borders. The right to impose internal taxes was peremptorily refused, but after some delay all the States, except New York, granted the right to collect duties on imports. New York went so far as to concede her customs duties to the general government, provided they should be collected by her own officers and her own depreciated State scrip should be receivable for duties. These conditions were, of course, inadmissible, and so it happened that the new member of the family of nations became independent and bankrupt at about the same time. The external pressure of war being removed, all the ante-revolutionary conceptions of government revived, excepting only that of allegiance to Great Britain. Even the degrading spectacle of public insolvency did not avail to bring the States closer together. Colonial rights had blossomed into State rights. Some of the forms of government had been changed, but the ideas remained substantially the same as before. It was not until the varying customs duties of the several States and the hostile commercial legislation of England had prostrated trade and brought private bankruptcy on the heels of public, that the States began to consider the expediency of surrendering some of their reserved powers in order to give greater efficiency to the whole. The Convention which framed the constitution of the United States had its origin in a conference called by the State of Virginia to regulate the trade and navigation of the Potomac River and Chesapeake Bay.

A long and doubtful struggle ensued in the Convention between colonial prejudice and national necessity. Things reached so desperate a pass that Franklin proposed prayers to Almighty God, for that the wit of man had been exhausted.¹ Necessity finally triumphed over prejudice in the Convention, but the victory of the national party only led to a fiercer and more protracted contest in the States over the question of ratifying the constitution. That the Convention did in express terms declare the constitution and the laws and treaties made in pur-

(1) "The hope of ultimate success must have been small indeed, when such a proposition could be made by Franklin, strongly inclined as he was to rationalism, a man who at heart was averse to all religious demonstration, and who, even in the darkest hours of the war, had carried his head very high."—VON HOLST, p. 51.

suance of it to be the supreme law of the land, and did provide for the establishment of courts to have jurisdiction of all cases arising under said constitution, laws, and treaties, can be seen by reference to the instrument itself. But a discussion of the alleged right of a State to nullify an act of Congress would be premature at this place, since that was the question almost continuously in dispute till it was settled in 1861-5 by the wager of battle. It is certain that the right of a State to secede from the Union after once entering it was freely discussed at the time and was decided in the negative. Both New York and Virginia desired to ratify with conditions, reserving the right to withdraw if the conditions were not complied with. They were told plainly that this could not be done—that they must ratify or reject unconditionally. Virginia ratified in this manner, at last by 88 votes against 80 in her Convention, and New York by 31 against 29.¹ Massachusetts took a long time to deliberate, and eventually ratified by 187 votes against 168. The most effective advocates of the constitution were Hamilton in New York and Madison in Virginia—two States whose ratification was most important, and at the same time most difficult to obtain. We shall soon see to what contrary conclusions Hamilton and Madison came in their interpretation of the ratified instrument. The whole history of the period goes to confirm the observation of John Quincy Adams, that the constitution was “extorted from the grinding necessity of a reluctant people.”

No wonder that an active minority remained full of hostility to the new order of things, whose cries in behalf of what they called their lost liberties filled the public ear for a whole generation. Threats were made to break the Union before the close of the last century, and a political party came into being, almost simultaneously with the constitution, claiming, under and by virtue of the instrument itself, the right to nullify any act of Congress which might be considered to infringe any right of a State. If any such right existed it necessarily included the right of secession as a last resort. This party took the name of Republican, from its attachment to the principles of the French Revolution. It sought to stigmatize its opponents as monarchists, but the title did not adhere. The name Federalist was that by which it was known to contemporaries and is known to history. The leader of the Republican party of that day was Thomas Jefferson, third President of the United States. Mr. Jefferson was the American minister to France at the time the constitution was framed. He wrote a long letter to Mr. Madison, signifying his general approval of the instrument, but foreshadowing

(1) A recent work by a French author (“*Les États-Unis Contemporains*,” par Claudio Jannet, Paris, 1876), which brings forward a stock of half-truths really too formidable for criticism, says (p. 31) that Virginia, New York, and Rhode Island, in their ratifications, expressly reserved the right to withdraw!

the course he subsequently took in his interpretation of it. He said: "I own I am not a friend to a very energetic government; it is always oppressive; it places the governors indeed more at their ease, but at the expense of the people. The late rebellion in Massachusetts (Shay's Rebellion) has given more alarm than I think it should have done. Calculate that one rebellion in thirteen States in the course of eleven years is but one for each State in a century and a-half. *No country should be so long without one.*" Somewhat later Mr. Jefferson clothed his notions of an ideal Union in these words: "An impotent general government is the condition precedent of liberty."

Mr. Jefferson was a Radical and a passionate admirer of the French Revolution. He believed that liberty and an efficient central government were incompatible with each other. In this belief he differed from his political associate and successor, Madison, who held that too much weakness in the central government would be as dangerous to liberty, through its tendency to license and consequent reaction, as too much strength. We are perhaps not far enough removed even yet from the agitations which they set on foot to form a perfectly unprejudiced judgment of their characters and work, but no one will deny that both contributed largely to their country's cause, and both exhibited at times the qualities of true statesmanship. Madison's, however, was less mixed with personal interest than Jefferson's, and his patriotism was of a purer, or at all events a less partisan, type. He was lacking in the power of will and continuity which distinguished Jefferson, and was led by the latter into errors which completely stultified him afterwards, but which he would most likely have escaped if left to his own cooler judgment. Mr. Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, a document which stamps him as a master of the English tongue, and proves, as Mr. Bancroft observes in the concluding chapter of his History, that "he was able with instinctive perception to read the soul of the nation." He suggested the prohibition of slavery in all the new territories (to take effect after the year 1800), and drafted an ordinance to that effect three years before the famous ordinance of 1787, prohibiting it in the north-west territory, was passed. He was at heart an anti-slavery man, and he sincerely desired the abolition of the institution in his native State, but was always careful to avoid offending the Virginia slave-holders by untimely expressions of his views. He conceived and accomplished the purchase of Louisiana, thus securing the mouth of the Mississippi and an immense territory on the west bank of that river. On the other hand, he was an extreme partisan and extremely ambitious, and he did not scruple to employ the arts of the demagogue to obtain a party advantage. He was in fact a consummate politician, and the best party leader of his time. In the way of backbiting he had few equals. His letter to

Washington, accusing Hamilton of the purpose and desire to establish a monarchical government, and his letter to Mazzei, accusing Washington of the same thing in substance, are couched in terms which compel us to think that, at the time they were written, he really believed his own preposterous statements. They serve to show a narrowness or crookedness of vision of which there are many other examples in his career. Washington was convinced that Jefferson had intrigued against him while yet a member of his cabinet, and the intercourse of the two became subsequently of a ceremonious character. "His [Jefferson's] mode of thought was a mixture of about equal parts of dialectical acuteness, and of the fanaticism of superficiality, as shortsighted as it was daring."¹ Finally, the principles of federal government, of which he became the champion and expounder, were fundamentally wrong, and have been productive of untold mischief. Those principles were embodied in the resolutions passed by the legislatures of Kentucky and Virginia in the year 1798, which will be examined hereafter.

Opposed to Jefferson's theory of government and of the constitution, in all its parts, was the master-spirit of Washington's first cabinet, Alexander Hamilton, of New York. Born in the West Indies, of mixed Scotch and French Huguenot blood, he combined in the highest degree the perseverance and acumen of the one race with the versatility of the other. Sent to New York to be educated, he entered Columbia College, and was pursuing his studies there, when the differences between the colonies and the mother-country became sufficiently pronounced to engage the earnest thought of all classes. At the age of seventeen he produced a series of essays on the Rights of the Colonies, which attracted general attention. "There are displayed in these papers," says a competent authority, "a power of reasoning and sarcasm, a knowledge of the principles of government and of the English constitution, and a grasp of the merits of the whole controversy, that would have done honour to any man at any age, and in a youth of seventeen are wonderful."²

About the same time he gave indications, in a public speech at Boston, of that rare eloquence which in after years enabled him to sway public assemblages and to bring hard-headed and hostile legislative bodies to his way of thinking in spite of themselves. At the age of nineteen he entered the patriot army as Captain of Artillery, and after a short service in this capacity was chosen by General Washington as his confidential aide-de-camp; with him he remained till near the close of the war. When Washington was elected President he called Hamilton again to his councils and tendered him

(1) Von Holst, p. 160.

(2) Hist. Constitution of the U.S., by Geo. Ticknor Curtis.

the post of chief importance and chief difficulty, that of Secretary of the Treasury, in which he well earned the felicitous encomium pronounced upon him, a generation later, by Daniel Webster: "He smote the rock of the national resources, and abundant streams of revenue gushed forth; he touched the dead corpse of the public credit, and it sprang upon its feet." To his exertions and to Madison's in about equal measure had the country been indebted for the ratification of the constitution. To his sagacity mainly is it due that the new government was not strangled in its infancy. With untiring industry, unerring foresight, and sleepless vigilance, he frustrated the efforts of the party of disintegration of his day. Against his generalship numbers availed nothing, nor did the ingratitude and insubordination of his own party ever daunt him. He saw clearly the object to be attained, and when his own friends deserted him he made use of his enemies to accomplish his ends, which were always his country's. The more superficial parts of Jefferson were no match for his active and clairvoyant genius. One by one he laid the timbers of a stable, self-sustaining, self-propelling government, and at last he sealed his devotion to his principles with his blood; for not even the death of Lincoln was more signally due to his faithfulness to the Union cause, than that of Hamilton when he exposed his body to the pistol shot of Aaron Burr. Hamilton believed that a nation could be made out of the political débris that the revolutionary war had left. That those jealous and discordant materials did not constitute a nation he was perfectly well aware. He had the courage and capacity to undertake the task; but he looked too far into the future to be a successful politician. Hence, although he carried his point in settling the character of the new government, he lost the prizes of statesmanship, and Jefferson gained them.

President Washington's cabinet was constructed on the plan of attempting to harmonize parties—a plan of government which, although erroneous in general, was not ill adapted to the circumstances of the time. Both Jefferson and Hamilton had places in it. But Washington's confidence was given in such marked degree to the latter that the former eventually retired in disgust, acknowledging that he had been led by his rival, in one instance at least, to support a measure intended to strengthen the Government, and that he considered it the greatest mistake of his life.

The principal measures proposed by Hamilton, having for their object the creation of an efficient central government, and the perpetuation of the Union, were the funding bill (including in that phrase the bill for the assumption of the State debts), the excise law and the first National Bank charter. Although nothing was more absolutely necessary to the prosperity of the Union than

Hamilton's funding bill, or some kindred measure for restoring the public credit; although no argument had been more effective in calling the Philadelphia Convention together than the destruction of that credit, the measure was opposed by the Anti-Federalists on the express ground that it would tend to strengthen the Union and thereby weaken by comparison the sovereignty of the States. Even Mr. Madison opposed it upon this ground. The bill was defeated upon its first introduction in the House, but Hamilton rallied his forces a second time and carried his point by a piece of "log-rolling." The representatives of Maryland and Virginia desired to have the National capital located on the banks of the Potomac River. Hamilton persuaded enough of his friends to vote for this change of the seat of Government to carry it through, and in return secured enough votes to pass the funding bill. But he was shocked at the character of the opposition he had encountered, and he recorded his opinion of it by saying: "It is the first symptom of a spirit which must be killed, or it will kill the constitution of the United States" — a saying which waited three quarters of a century for its entire fulfilment, but which vindicated itself signally in each succeeding decade.

The bill for an excise on distilled spirits was brought forward for the double purpose of obtaining means to meet the requirements of the funding act, and of strengthening the Union by seizing a source of revenue which might otherwise have been appropriated by the States. The State-rights party saw the latter point a moment too late, and although the bill had become a law they began with one accord to oppose its enforcement, and when an insurrection sprang up in Western Pennsylvania to defeat the collection of the tax, they managed to delay, for the space of three years, the employment of force to put it down. This was the earliest act of outright nullification that had been witnessed since the adoption of the constitution. Though not sanctioned by the authority of Pennsylvania or any other State, it enlisted the sympathies and indirect aid of the entire opposition party. When Hamilton at last persuaded Washington to take decisive steps by military force to put down the insurgents, a perfect storm of vilification rained upon him. Fifteen thousand militia were called for and sent into camp under Washington's personal supervision. Hamilton himself marched with them to the scene of the disturbances, apprehensive to the very last that they might throw down their arms and return home. The insurgents were extremely valiant when they had to deal only with tax-collectors, sheriffs, and a dozen or more soldiers stationed at an old wooden fort, but when the army of coercion arrived the champions of the divine right of distillation were nowhere to be found in any organized force. The leaders, conspicuous among whom was Albert Gallatin,

were fain to sue for pardon on any terms that would save their necks, and their deluded followers took refuge in their own native obscurity. It was an important victory to Hamilton and his party, for it was the first forcible assertion of the national authority over local insubordination. Even as late as 1861 the example had not lost its potency. "Did not Washington put down the whisky rebellion in 1794?" exclaimed the Union orators and newspapers when the slaveholders' rebellion commenced. Technically, the two cases were not parallel, but for practical purposes they were sufficiently so.

The events which called forth the famous "Resolutions of '98" were intimately connected with the French Revolution. This great social upheaval was welcomed with almost universal acclaim in America, but as it progressed from wholesome reform to rapine and terror, the zeal of the Federalists cooled toward their republican brothers on the other side of the water. Washington himself was determined that, whatever might be the sympathies of the people, the country should not be embroiled in the struggle during his Presidency. The French authorities were determined that it should be so embroiled, calculating that whenever a breach of neutrality should occur, the prevailing republican sympathy and the memories of the late war would infallibly bring the United States to their side. In this they might have succeeded, but for the intolerable insolence of their two ministers, Genet and Adet, both of whom affected to hold relations with "the people" of the United States as distinguished from the Government; Genet going so far as to treat the country as a French colony, fitting out privateers, enlisting troops, and issuing commissions to officers on American soil. There is too much reason to believe that Genet was secretly encouraged in this course by Jefferson, who was then Secretary of State. Although the French Directory were compelled to recall Genet, their subsequent acts showed that they approved his proceedings. Bent upon forcing Washington out of his position of neutrality, they organized a political campaign in the United States through pamphlets, newspapers, handbills, clubs, and inflammatory appeals to the memories of '76. They insulted Washington in every possible way, even insinuating, in a formal address to Minister Monroe, that he (Washington) was aiming to lead the people of the Union "back to their former slavery." If they had confined themselves to words, they might have carried their point so far as to bring the people over to their side, and eventually the Government also. But their military successes had emboldened them to make an application of force as well as of persuasion, and by seizing and confiscating a number of American vessels, freighted in whole or in part with British goods, in violation of the express provisions of a treaty, they speedily paralysed the influence

of their best friends in America. Negotiations on the subject of the seizure of vessels grew exasperating. Minister Pinckney was ordered out of France, and even threatened with imprisonment under the French alien law. When finally Talleyrand attempted to impose a heavy fine upon the United States, and demanded in addition thereto a personal gratuity of twelve hundred thousand livres for the Directory and ministers, as conditions of restoring a good understanding, the nation resolutely began preparations for war.

Washington was again invested with the chief command, John Adams having succeeded him as President, and Hamilton again became his first lieutenant in the field. While the people were in daily expectation of the opening of hostilities, the Republicans being thoroughly cowed, and Jefferson very despondent, a couple of laws were passed by Congress (to continue in operation two and three years respectively) to rid the country of the emissaries of the French Government, and to curb the licentiousness of the French sympathising press, clubs, associations, &c. These are known to history as the alien and sedition laws. They were approved by Washington and Patrick Henry, as well as by President Adams. Hamilton did not doubt their constitutionality, but thought them "highly exceptionable," as tending to tyranny and likely to consolidate and strengthen the opposition to the Government, rather than to intimidate and weaken it. In the light of the present day the alien and sedition laws find no defenders; but it is a fact not generally remembered that the opposition of the Republican party of the last century to these measures was based, not upon the infringement of liberty, but the infringement of State rights embodied in them.¹ It was their view, that if any alien or sedition laws were required, they should be passed by the State legislatures, and not by Congress. It is only thus that we can understand the counter-measures proposed by Jefferson—the famous "resolutions of '98." The alien and sedition laws, although not intended to promote party ends, could not fail to produce effects upon parties, since they would actually suppress a portion of the machinery by which the opposition saw fit to conduct their political campaigns. Heretofore the opposition had confined themselves to fitful and uncertain objections to particular measures of the Government, but they had had no rallying point, and no well-defined principles as to home politics. Sympathy with republican France could not be expected to last for ever, nor could it be depended on even now, when subjected to the strains put upon it by Talleyrand, Genet, and Adet. The time had come, in Jefferson's view, to establish a rallying point, and to fix some principles. He believed that the

(1) Professor Von Holst does not make this point clear. The resolutions of '98 would not be logical if directed merely to the vindication of the freedom of speech and of the press.

successive invasions of State sovereignty had reached a crisis in the alien and sedition laws, and that now, or never, a determined resistance must be made. Hence the resolutions of '98.

Two sets of resolutions, differing somewhat in phraseology, were passed, the one by the legislature of Virginia, and the other by that of Kentucky. Those of Kentucky were the more pointed and outspoken of the two, but they were alike in substance, and had a common origin. Those of Virginia were drawn up by Madison at Jefferson's request, and were passed by the legislature of that State, December 21, 1798. They declare that the powers of the federal government result from a compact to which the States are parties, to be construed by the plain sense and intention of the constitution, and that in case of a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of other powers not granted by the said compact, the States which are parties thereto "have the right and are in duty bound to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining within their respective limits the authorities, rights, and liberties appertaining to them." The Kentucky resolutions recite that the constitution was a compact, to which each State was an integral party; that the general government was not the sole judge of the powers delegated to itself, but that as in all other cases of compact among parties having no common judge, each party had an equal right to judge for itself, as well of the infraction, as of the mode and manner of redress. Also that the several States which formed the constitution, "being sovereign and independent, have the unquestionable right to judge of the infraction, and that a nullification by these sovereignties of all unauthorised acts done under colour of that instrument is the rightful remedy." Two copies of the Kentucky resolutions in the handwriting of Jefferson, varying slightly in language but not in idea, were found among his papers after his death, and there is abundant historical evidence apart from this, that he was the author of both sets, and that he persuaded Mr. Madison to prepare them for the legislature of Virginia, and Colonel Nicholas to introduce them in that of Kentucky. It appears, therefore, that Mr. Calhoun was no more the author of the doctrine of nullification than Jefferson Davis was. Both drew their inspiration from the so-called republican party of the last century, and appealed to some of the most venerated names in American history for their justification. It should be kept in mind that this doctrine was not an assertion of its right of revolution, but of a constitutional right to resist constituted authority.

The Federalists remained in power twelve years, but they were not really a majority of the people at any time. The universal confidence reposed in Washington, the superior statesmanship of the Federalist leaders, the wealth, education, and social position of their

followers, and the extravagant and unprincipled demands of the French Directory, had together outweighed the popular leaning toward France, and the still lively animosity toward Great Britain. But this leaning and this animosity were constant quantities, while the opposing forces were variable. Washington had retired to private life, and his successor, John Adams, had picked a personal quarrel with Hamilton, and a public one with the bulk of his party, by sending a new mission to France before the insults of Talleyrand had been atoned or apologised for. This step on the part of Mr. Adams has been variously accounted for; but supposing it to have been in the highest degree patriotic, it is certain that it was taken without consulting any member of his cabinet or any person entitled to be called a leader of the party. Consequently, the merits of the step in a diplomatic and international point of view, however great they may have been, were, in a party point of view, completely frustrated by the manner of taking it. Many Federalists believed that Adams had gone over to the Republicans. The Republicans themselves, who were still greatly dispirited, notwithstanding some local gains they had made in the South through the unpopularity of the alien and sedition laws, plucked up courage wonderfully, claiming that they had been right all the time in their policy of kissing the hand that smote them. The result was, that Mr. Adams failed of a re-election. Jefferson and Burr (Republicans), received a tie vote in the electoral college, and the election was thrown into the House of Representatives, where neither of them could get a clear majority without the help of the Federalists.

The mass of the Republican voters intended that Jefferson should be President and Burr Vice-President; but under the provisions of the Constitution at that time each Presidential elector voted for two persons, the one receiving the highest number of votes to be President, and the one receiving the next highest to be Vice-President. In case of a tie, the House of Representatives was required to choose the President, each State having one vote, and a majority of the States being requisite to a choice. In order to worry the Republicans and to spite Jefferson, a portion of the Federalists conceived the idea of electing Burr President. There were now sixteen States in the Union, of which Jefferson and Burr could count on six each, leaving four in the control of the Federalists. When Hamilton, who had meanwhile retired to private life, learned of the intrigue between Burr and the Federalists, he threw his whole influence in favour of Jefferson. He told his friends that if there was any man in the world whom he ought to hate that man was Jefferson, but that Burr was at heart a Catiline, bent upon ruling the country by uniting the scoundrels of all parties, and that "upon every virtuous and prudent calculation Jefferson was to be preferred." In Burr he saw

the enemy of his country, and in Jefferson only his own enemy. Exactly how far his counsels were instrumental in bringing about the defeat of Burr is not known, but considering his recognised position as the most trusted leader of his party, and considering also the very narrow escape which Jefferson had, we must conclude that they were very important if not decisive.¹ While the balloting was going on in the House some of the Federalists proposed to make the dead-lock permanent, as they had the power to do, and choose a presiding officer of the Senate, vesting the executive power in him by statute until a President should be lawfully chosen. Even Mr. Adams thought this was feasible, and that the people would be as well satisfied with it as with the election of either Burr or Jefferson. But Jefferson took care to notify them that on the day such a statute should be passed, the middle States would arm and overthrow a government so constituted. In point of fact steps were taken to make good this threat. The building of an armoury at Richmond, which had been commenced during the alien-and-sedition-law excitement, was recommenced, and a plan set on foot to seize the Government arsenal at Harper's Ferry. The Federalists were scared out of their project, which was clearly unconstitutional and revolutionary.

Although the Federalists had gone out of power never to return, their policy had been impressed on the new Government so firmly that their successful opponents made no attempt to undo their work. While labouring to defeat Burr, Hamilton predicted that Jefferson, once in power, would not disturb the measures which had been adopted to strengthen the Government. In point of fact, he was soon compelled to use stronger measures than the Federalists had ever employed. The Federalists, on the other hand, began to construe the constitution with the aid of Jefferson's dictionary. The proposed purchase of Louisiana alarmed the New England States. They apprehended that the addition of this extensive dominion would give the South a perpetual preponderance in the Union and control of the Government. There was no clause in the constitution expressly conferring upon Congress the power to acquire foreign territory. They became great sticklers for "strict construction." Some of them claimed that a constitutional amendment was necessary; while others, reverting to the resolutions of '98, declared that since the constitution was a compact, in the nature of a partnership, it was impossible to take in new partners without the consent of *all*

(1) If we may credit the statement of Burr's biographer (Parton), Jefferson's subsequent behaviour presented a very sorry contrast to this example of magnanimity on the part of his rival. When, according to this authority, Hamilton's assassin arrived in Washington City after the fatal encounter, Jefferson received him with marks of attention, and gave him at least one and probably two appointments to important offices for his (Burr's) friends—the secretaryship and governorship of Louisiana Territory.

the old ones, and that the taking in of a new one without such consent would release the old ones. The Republicans contended that the power to acquire territory was one of the necessary attributes of sovereignty, inherent in every government, whatever its name or character. Jefferson himself could not abandon all the theories he had been elaborating these twelve years for the confusion of his enemies and the admiration of posterity. Nor could he let the opportunity to acquire Louisiana slip by. So he acknowledged that the step he had determined to take was unconstitutional, and proceeded forthwith to take it. The acquisition of Louisiana served to strengthen the Government, not only by the possession of the mouth of the Mississippi, but by committing to the doctrine of "constructive powers" the only party that had up to this time denied it.

The Federalists, however, soon found new occasions to change ground with their adversaries. The British orders in council, and the Berlin and Milan decrees of Napoleon, fell with great severity on American commerce. Jefferson was opposed on the score of principle to a war with France, and on the score of interest to a war with England. As a measure of retaliation he recommended an embargo on American commerce. In this he was at first sustained by the country with singular unanimity, even John Quincy Adams voting for the measure. But the weight of the blow fell upon New England with tenfold greater severity than upon Old England. Indeed it was scarcely noticed in the latter country, while in the former it inflicted greater injury than the orders in council and the decrees of Napoleon combined. Opposition to the embargo became very decided. It worked its way into New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland. But Jefferson and his party were so convinced that the deprivation of American products would eventually bring England to terms, that they adhered to it with the utmost tenacity. The war of words was at its height when John Quincy Adams whispered to Jefferson that a combination had been formed in the North having for its object a disruption of the Union, and Jefferson was so much alarmed by it that he recommended a repeal of the embargo and a war with England in its stead. How far Mr. Adams was justified in saying that the Union was in danger in consequence of the embargo is still a matter of dispute. When his statement to Jefferson leaked out, some fifteen years later, Mr. Adams was called upon by thirteen eminent citizens of Massachusetts to give a full and precise account of the facts and evidence constituting the foundation of so injurious a charge. In replying to this request, Mr. Adams went back to the acquisition of Louisiana in 1803, five years earlier than the embargo, and said that a plan had been formed then, by certain Federalist leaders, to dissolve the Union, and that it had gone so far as to fix upon a military

commander to carry it into execution; that his knowledge of it alienated him from the secret councils of the party; that the conspiracy of 1808 which he communicated to Mr. Jefferson was a continuance and revival of the proposed revolt against the Louisiana purchase, for which the public exasperation against the embargo seemed to furnish a new opportunity; and finally that a sense of solemn duty might at some future day require him to disclose the evidence in his possession for these grave allegations, but that the selection of the day for such disclosure, whether in his own lifetime or later, must remain in his own judgment. Nearly thirty years have elapsed since Mr. Adams's death, but the disclosure has not yet been made. The absence of any motive for misrepresentation, no less than his elevated character and his ample sources of information, must convince us that there was some substantial ground for his statements. Moreover, Mr. Hamilton was so keenly alive to the dangers of the plot in 1803 and 1804 that, in his efforts to frustrate it, he became involved in the controversy with Burr, which ended in the fatal duel between them.

Jefferson's proposed war with England was voted down by a decisive majority in Congress. Madison succeeded him as President, and sought to secure the exemption of American shipping from the harsh and unjustifiable measures of the belligerents in Europe by negotiation. Three years of indefatigable letter writing, mingled with threats of war in the American Congress and entreaties for peace among British manufacturers, resulted in the revocation of both the Berlin and Milan decrees and the orders in council. But war with England had been declared two months before the news of the revocation was received. Hostilities had not actually commenced, and a hope was entertained among the commercial classes of the North that the repeal of the obnoxious orders would avert bloodshed. But a war party had grown up in Congress under the spur of continued provocations, led by Clay and Calhoun, fired with the idea of conquering and annexing Canada, and reaping glory and political capital from that undertaking. The so-called right of search and the impressment of seamen on board American vessels, claimed and exercised by Great Britain, were indeed a sore grievance, sufficient to have justified a war without any other causes of difference, but as this was not the cause of the war-preparations in the first place, and as it was not clear that it might not have been removed by negotiation, and as it was wholly ignored in the subsequent treaty of Ghent, we are constrained to believe that the real reason for rejecting the tardy and ungracious concessions offered by Lord Castlereagh was something else. Whatever may have been the motives of the junta that overcame Mr. Madison's strong aversion to war, the two countries soon came to blows. As the war was without definite aim on

either side, so was it without definite result. The New England States, which were the principal sufferers from it, tacitly resolved to contribute nothing to it beyond what the letter of the law demanded. The anti-war party soon acquired a majority in the legislatures of New York and New Jersey, and at times carried the elections in Delaware and Maryland. The war-party became greatly exasperated at their want of success in the field, which they attributed, with considerable justice, to a lack of energy on the part of those who believed that the conflict was unnecessary, and therefore wrong. A new and more stringent embargo was enacted, as much for the purpose of punishing the New England States as of annoying the enemy, whereupon the Massachusetts legislature, taking the ideas and borrowing, in part, the language of the resolutions of '98, used these memorable words: "We spurn the idea that the free, sovereign, and independent State of Massachusetts is reduced to a mere municipal corporation, without power to protect its people and defend them from oppression from whatever quarter it comes. When the national compact is violated and the citizens of the State are oppressed by cruel and unauthorized law, this legislature is bound to interpose its power and wrest from the oppressor his victim." •

Here was the doctrine of State sovereignty in full measure. It was followed by the refusal of Massachusetts, and of Connecticut also, to allow Federal officers to take command of their militia, and by the call for the Hartford Convention. This convention was stigmatised as a hotbed of treason by the party in power, and is not considered at the present time a desirable place to trace one's political lineage back to. But it never went beyond the fundamental principles of Democratic-Republican faith, as written by Jefferson and Madison themselves. Both parties had, for the time being, changed coats—the Federalists asserting State sovereignty, and their opponents national sovereignty. Three of the New England States were represented in the Hartford Convention by regular delegates, and the other two by irregular ones. But it led to no result except to bring its participants under a load of obloquy—negotiations for peace having been instituted before it concluded its sittings. It recommended to the States represented the adoption of measures to protect their citizens against forcible drafts, conscriptions, or impressments not authorized by the constitution—an ominous proceeding if the States were to judge for themselves of the constitutionality of such drafts and conscriptions. Its other recommendations were technically unobjectionable, although the spirit governing the whole was a defensive league between the New England States. These recommendations were formally accepted by Massachusetts and Connecticut, and that was as far as the project ever got. The conclusion of peace rendered it nugatory, and perhaps saved Mr. Madison a task

he was by no means equal to—that of combatting a rebellion founded upon the resolutions of '98.

From this time forward there has never been in the North any important assertion of the right of a State to nullify an act of Congress. Some decisions were made in Northern State courts overruling the fugitive slave law, on the ground that it was an infringement of State jurisdiction, but when these decisions were overruled by the United States Supreme Court, the judgments of the latter tribunal were always acquiesced in. Two petitions from the North asking for a peaceable dissolution of the Union, presented in Congress by John Quincy Adams and Joshua R. Giddings, in the year 1842, but disavowed by those gentlemen, caused great commotion in the House of Representatives; but even the small consequence that could justly be attached to them, was not derived from the doctrine of State sovereignty or from the principles embodied in the resolutions of '98. These principles henceforward found their home exclusively in the South, where they had been first formulated, and where they dovetailed with slavery in so firm a bond that the one could not be destroyed without shattering the other also.

The agitation in the South against the Protective Tariff of 1828 was intimately connected with the slavery question. The North was gaining rapidly in wealth, population, and political importance, notwithstanding the Louisiana purchase, which had so greatly alarmed the New England Federalists thirty years before. The South was lagging behind her unfettered rival, and becoming more and more jealous and discontented every year. Blinded by her "peculiar institution," she refused to see in it any cause for her backwardness in material prosperity, and sought to find reasons for it in the legislation of the country. The tariff had been growing more and more protective for several years, fulfilling the prediction of those who had declared in the beginning that, no amount of protection would be satisfactory to the protected classes more than a few years, and that a stiffer line would be called for soon. The tariff of 1828 was the stiffest that had ever been called for. The hostility of the planting States to this measure, however, was not merely opposition to a bad fiscal policy, but was an outburst of anger at the badge of inferiority which the census-taker was putting on them every ten years, which they ascribed, honestly perhaps, to the tariff. Shortly after the inauguration of President Jackson, the opposition to the tariff in South Carolina took a very decided attitude. In the summer of 1832, Mr. Calhoun, one of the senators of that State, published an address "On the Relations of the States and Federal Government." He commenced by saying that the question of those relations was not one of recent origin, but that, from the commencement of the government, it had divided public sentiment. He then

proceeded to plant himself on the Virginia resolutions of 1798, saying that "the right of *interposition* thus solemnly asserted by the State of Virginia, be it called as it may—State right, veto, nullification, or by any other name—I conceive to be the fundamental principle of our system, resting upon facts historically as certain as our revolution itself, and deductions as simple and as demonstrative as that of any political or moral truth whatever." On the 24th of November following, the Convention of South Carolina passed an ordinance declaring the tariff law null and void, and making it unlawful for the officers of the general government to collect any duties in that State. If force should be employed to collect such duties, South Carolina would consider herself absolved from all allegiance to the Union, and would proceed at once to organize a separate government.

President Jackson replied by sending a message to Congress, affirming that the constitution of the United States was a *government*, and not a *compact*, that the language of the instrument itself declaring that it, and the laws, and treaties made in pursuance of it, should be *the supreme law of the land*, and that all State courts should be bound by it, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding, excluded the idea that a State could declare and treat such supreme law as a nullity. His argument, a very able one, was pointedly opposed to the resolutions of '98. The Democratic party of the present day claims descent in the direct line from Jefferson and Jackson, and the claim is in one sense true, but not at all valuable; for if ever there were two men holding opinions more diametrically opposed to each other as to the vital principles of the constitution and government of their country, history has not mentioned them. Nevertheless, Jackson was not anxious to press the controversy with South Carolina to a bloody issue. He recommended the passage of a new law to enforce the collection of duties in South Carolina, but at the same time he recommended a reduction of the duties. If the duties had not been reduced it is probable that he would have brought the State into obedience by military force, because he was a soldier, and he believed in the employment of force. Mr. Clay even accused him of a desire to gratify his passions by spilling the blood of his enemies in South Carolina; but there is the best evidence that he wished to avoid that necessity. Mr. Clay, himself the champion of the tariff, was the first to back down. He had been eager for a war with England when there was no substantial cause for it, and now he was equally anxious to avoid a war for which there was abundant cause. Through his influence the tariff of 1828 was reduced one-half, the reductions extending over a series of years by a sliding scale—a measure the wisdom of which would be conceded if it had not been extorted under a threat.

The South Carolina Convention was reassembled, and the nullifying ordinance repealed on the express ground that the tariff had been modified to meet the views of the nullifiers. The doctrine of State sovereignty, nullification, or secession—all names for the same thing—received enormous impetus and strength from the temporary triumph achieved for it in 1832, and the slave power incorporated it still more strongly into their political creed, and enlarged it year by year, till it came to include the right to carry slaves into free territory, and hold them there against the will of the majority.

It would be impossible within the limits of this article to touch upon all the manifestations of the struggle between the opposing ideas of State and national sovereignty prior to the death-grapple between them, which commenced in 1861, and ended in 1865 in the complete demolition of the doctrines laid down in the resolutions of '98. Strongly convinced as the writer is that the language of the constitution, as originally framed and ratified, lodged the sovereign power in the national government exclusively, it is apparent that nothing short of superior force could ever have settled the dispute after it became complicated with the pecuniary interests and bitter passions of slavery. It is likewise apparent that until the question was decided the United States could not logically be counted a nation. While one-half, or nearly one-half, of the people maintained and believed that the general government was a mere agency, or power of attorney, revocable at pleasure, and while they had power to give effect to such views, the nationality existed only in the vain imaginings of those who held the contrary opinion. The birth of the nation, therefore, does not really date from the 4th of July, 1776, but from the day whereon the theories of Thomas Jefferson were crushed by force and arms. Mr. Jefferson's desire for a rebellion oftener than once in a century and a half has been gratified beyond his most sanguine expectations. Considering the state of the world at the time he played his part in it, we need not blame him for the views he held, but in awarding the palm of statesmanship, which is the gift of seeing in advance how institutions will operate upon society, we must pass him by and place it on the brow of his great rival.

Although it may now be said that a dual sovereignty has been proven by the strongest of all arguments to be a self-contradiction and an impossibility, Professor Von Holst observes that the idea still clings after the thing itself has vanished. This is true, for "he who's convinced against his will, is of the same opinion still." How extensively the old idea prevails in men's bosoms cannot be ascertained, but something may be inferred from the action of the political party that formerly supported and maintained it. The Federalist party had been ground to powder, and ceased to exist, during the administration of James Monroe, whose second election

to the Presidency was accomplished without opposition. For want of opposition, the Democratic-Republican party broke into four fragments in the election of 1824 without any essential difference of principles; and no candidate receiving a majority of the electoral votes, John Quincy Adams was chosen President by the House of Representatives. A few years later, the fragments crystallised into the Democratic party under the leadership of General Jackson; and the National Republican party under that of Adams and Clay. The latter organisation was soon afterwards merged, with sundry desertions from the Jackson ranks, in the American Whig party, which survived till 1856, when it succumbed to the exigencies of the slavery question, and gave way to the existing Republican party. In 1852, the Democratic party for the first time took cognizance of the slavery question in its national platform, and in close juxtaposition declared the principles laid down in the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of 1798 and Mr. Madison's report thereon to be one of the main foundations of its political creed. This declaration was repeated in the party platform of 1856. In 1860 the Democratic party divided in sunder, and both fragments reaffirmed the platform of 1856. In 1864, the war being in progress, the resolutions of '98 were prudently omitted. In 1868 the party declared that the right of regulating the suffrage belonged to the several States, and that any attempt by Congress to interfere with it would, if sanctioned by the people, "end in a single, centralised, consolidated government, in which the separate existence of the States will be entirely absorbed, and an unqualified despotism be established in place of a federal union of co-equal States." Two years later the suffrage was regulated in all the States by an amendment of the constitution. The Democratic party, in its platform of the present year, declares its "devotion to the constitution of the United States, *with its amendments*, universally accepted as a final settlement of the controversy that engendered the civil war." The old idea, however, timidly shows its head in another paragraph, where it is declared that reform is necessary to save the Union from the dangers of a "corrupt centralism," the voter being left to infer vaguely whether the dangers are due most to corruption or to centralism. This is the attenuated skeleton of the resolutions of '98. Nevertheless a large body of opinion remains, under the influence of party bias or early training, favourable to the idea of State sovereignty co-existing with national sovereignty, and this is not confined wholly to the Democratic party. A certain vagueness even pervades the Republican party, from whose midst we not infrequently hear that the States are sovereign "within their sphere"—the sphere being as undefined as the spheres assigned for our future abode in the textbooks of modern spiritualism. The full extent of the defeat suffered

by the State rights party in the late war is only half understood by either victors or vanquished. The official seal of the State of Illinois is still inscribed with the motto "State sovereignty, national Union"—a phrase whose suggestions convey no idea of national sovereignty whatever. Yet the State of Illinois has been under the control of the Republican party during sixteen years. Most of the State constitutions contain clauses providing for the punishment of treason against the State. These provisions are incongruous with existing facts, for it is quite conceivable that a citizen might be hanged for treason against a State, and his judges and executioners hanged for treason against the United States. All the apparatus for such a solecism was in readiness in South Carolina in the year 1832.

Notwithstanding the more or less confusion in the public mind on the subject of State *versus* national sovereignty, State sovereignty now goes to the wall in every practical conflict. Nor will its entire disappearance be followed by the "unqualified despotism" apprehended by Jefferson, and presaged by the Democratic party as late as 1868. An unqualified despotism enacted by a free people upon themselves can only be the result of general corruption and stupefaction of the public morals—a condition in no wise dependent upon the concentration or dispersion of sovereignty. The only form of centralization to be feared is that which grows out of the existing method of making appointments to Federal offices—a method which, when first introduced, Mr. Clay said would, if persisted in, "finally end in a despotism as intolerable as that of Constantinople," and which even General Jackson, before his election to the Presidency, allowed would tend inevitably to corruption.¹ Centralization coming in this form would be equally effective whether the theories of State sovereignty or of national sovereignty should prevail. The immediate need of the American people and Government is a restoration of the permanent civil service which prevailed during the first forty years after the adoption of the constitution. Apart from this, it is the logical outcome of the war that the powers of the general government shall continue to increase at the expense of the State governments, but not at the expense of liberty. The right of secession having been negatived beyond the possibility of dispute, its minor belongings, wearing the generic name of State sovereignty, must fall with it, not all at once, but as fast as they come in collision with the authority of the whole.

HORACE WHITE.

(1) The unwarranted interference by the Federal judiciary and army in the last Louisiana election was a direct consequence and outgrowth of the "spoils system" of civil service.

ENGLAND AND TURKEY.

“Deliver not the tasks of might,
To weakness.”

ALL men of all parties are agreed—as they could not but be, the facts once established—in their judgment on the atrocities in Bulgaria, one of those wild outbreaks of ferocity and lust which show the possible depth of evil in human nature when free from the restraints of social order. I say in human nature, and do not confine it to Turkish nature, as I see there is too much inclination to do under the impulse of the present excitement. “Highest of all, when under control, worst of all animals when without law and justice,”—this judgment on man bears no restrictive application. Our just abhorrence of the actual misdeeds of the Turkish troops seems to me to be hurrying us into unjust judgments and unwise actions.

For whilst I respect the motives of the present movement and within limits, which have at times been passed, I entirely concur in the indignation expressed, so far as it is the spontaneous expression of a real national feeling in presence of a great wrong, there is much in the language used which I deprecate, much in the conclusions sought to be enforced which I think dangerous, something at any rate in the national attitude which I think unwarranted. Something more of misgiving in this wholesale condemnation of another nation, something more of humility on the score of past events in our own history, something more of the sense of the community of nature between the Turkish people and our own, might have increased the value of our utterance, and invested it with additional promise for the future. Defective, however, as it has been in these respects, it has a promise for the future: it constitutes an obligation which cannot be eluded—the obligation whenever and wherever there be outrages on our common humanity, and that there will be such is too probable, to reprobate them as we reprobate this present outrage. For instance, whilst we loudly blame the Turkish mode of warfare in Servia, the destruction of villages by fire, and the devastation of the country, would it not be well if some voices were raised against our own practice, in the interests of the half-piratical trader too often, of shelling African or other uncivilised populations? or against such acts as in that unjustifiable Ashantee war was the burning of Coomassie? or in China the destruction of the imperial palace?

With a certain reserve, then, I respect the judgment on the past. But it is not with the past we have now to deal, except so far as we

can repair it; and I trust the reparation will be of the amplest kind, as it ought to be, considering the easy form which it may take for the majority—that of money contributions. Those who, as Lady Strangford, are willing to give their services in its distribution, should have no difficulty in collecting the sum they ask.

There remains one point in reference to the past in which injustice may be done. It is the responsibility attaching to the Turkish Government—its complicity in these Bulgarian horrors. Governments, as a rule, are ill served by their agents, who too often carry out instructions in a way which those who gave them in no way sanction. There have been exceptions, such as James II. in our own country and that of M. Thiers in France, where there is every reason to think that the mercilessness of the ruler outran that of the subordinates. But the rule is the other way, and the supreme government of Turkey is probably, if we take the statements of the two parties in England, not an exception. No doubt in the hour of danger, with other revolts on its hands and the prospect of the Servian and Montenegrin war, on hearing of the agitation and insurrection in Bulgaria, due, it would appear, to external intrigues, it wished a speedy termination,—what has been so much praised in England,—a vigorous stamping out of the evil at its beginning; but as a central government it does not seem to be further involved in the actual transaction. Like most other governments, it would be slow to recognise the misdeeds of its agents; but otherwise the fault lies rather in its weakness and actual disorganization, as was justly pointed out by Lord Derby, than in its intentions. That this is the true view is, I think, evidenced by its permitting foreigners to visit the localities and inquire for themselves, and tolerating their presence after their publication of the facts. Would Russia in Poland, the French Government after the suppression of the Commune, or our own Government in the Indian mutiny, have been equally patient? It would seem that no government has a sufficient hand upon its officers or its population—perhaps never has had, but certainly has not in the present day—a weakness which evidences the want of some more universal, more cogent influence to supplement the action of governments. Look at Barbadoes, or our conduct in Japan, or the dealings with the coolies in the Mauritius, of Queensland with the Oceanians.

And, generalising, how few nations of Europe—is there any one but Italy?—which is so clean-handed as to be justified in using unmeasured abuse of Turkey. Nationally, as individually, the true rule, doubtless, is to blame ourselves first before we attack our neighbours: but there are occasions, and such is this reckless denunciation of one people as compared with all others, when we survey the others, and inquire whether history justifies the implication of so complete a

disparity, and Poland, Algeria, Hungary, and Spanish America rise in its confutation.

I would gladly not write this, for in the prevalent one-sidedness of judgments, I know to what it exposes me; but when I see the lengths to which a dominant impression carries many in this matter, I feel it incumbent on me not to shrink from incurring any of the risk attendant on an impartial judgment.

In the present we have before us, practically, the choice of two policies, or rather two guidances, that of the existing government and of Mr. Gladstone, who I presume is ready to resume office. I say practically, for others are offered, but have no chance of being accepted. If I allude to Mr. Grant Duff's scheme, his dream he calls it, it is because of some of its accidents, rather than from any wish to discuss it fully. An Anglo-Indian administration under a dignified head,—such is its summary for those who may have missed it. He does not himself give the title of this dignified head, yet it should have been given, or the project lacks definiteness. It is implied that we are to have another Emperor of Western origin.

It seems to me a fresh instance of the corrupting influence of our Indian Empire. The temporary success of that experiment misleads us to the point of thinking that we are able to set the world in order, when it is a question whether we are not breaking down under what we have already undertaken. It would appear to be a postulate of a certain class of minds, that we, and we exclusively, have a peculiar faculty for government of other races;—an assumption of the most offensive and dangerous character, and which reposes at bottom on a completely official view of the results attained in our Indian dependency.

I would wish to speak with all due respect of a large body of public servants, of our Anglo-India administrative corps; but I have a recollection of certain points in our history there, in times of order and disorder equally, which suggest many objections to the proposal we have before us. Seriously, was the suppression of the Indian mutiny, even with what facts we have, and all competent students allow that many are yet unknown, that a full picture of the horrors of that suppression is for future generations—was, I ask, the suppression of that mutiny so conducted that we could with decency propose that the service which conducted it should furnish teachers of justice and mercy to the Turks? I know not what the language of the Constantinople governing classes was on the news reaching it of an insurrection in Bulgaria; but I do know something of that of the Calcutta governing community at the time of the Sepoy revolt, and it could not be easily surpassed as an expression of savage and vengeful cruelty. It is due to Lord Canning to say that he was, fortunately, a noble exception.

Or, again, are we to take some Anglo-Indian proconsul of the Dalhousie type, fresh from an unprincipled act of Burman spoliation, committed in defiance of all right under the plea of destiny, and think him a fit apostle to the Turks of moderation, of the duty of resigning this or that possession; of the moral beauty of contracting the red line of empire, of letting go provinces which their fathers acquired. No, at every turn our own past history meets us, not to stop our reasonable and thoughtful action for the better in the present, but to show us the unseemliness of many of our pretensions, and the wisdom of not seeking to increase our responsibilities.

And then the dignified head. Is it seriously proposed to take a young prince, of untried capacity for government,—the command of a ship of war is not by any means a particular recommendation, even if well administered,—a prince brought up in the blinding influences of the English court, more naturally blinding even than those of aristocratic life, a prince who has in no way produced as yet a favourable impression on a society disposed, as is evident from its tone about the rest of his family, to be most indulgent, and place him in a position requiring the highest gifts for rule, the most accomplished statesmanship? If he is to govern and not reign, the proposal is absurd, and for a constitutional puppet the position is not suited. So much on a point which it is difficult to touch. For in the current of servility which has set in of late in favour of our royal family, when only praise is allowed and any blame is thought discreditable, the only refuge for self-respect is silence—where it is possible. I have only said what was necessary to clear me from any participation in the prevailing adulation, which oppresses many besides myself with a sense of shame.

But of the two guides who are feasible, I will take Mr. Gladstone first. In adopting any one as a leader we naturally look to his antecedents. It is a time for free speech on such points. Mr. Gladstone's own language is very free. Dazed by a revolting act, which shocks all of us as much as it does him, he seems to have lost his equilibrium, and to be hurrying himself and the nation on very dangerous courses. What reason have we to follow him?

By a passionate appeal to the humanity and honour of England, he is thrusting a particular policy upon the Government, and practically wresting the conduct of affairs out of its hands. Are we to prefer him to his rivals as the exponent of those powerful motives? I think he has in his vehemence been too forgetful of his past.

Others, Mr. Beesly for instance, have drawn attention to the weakness of his position, on a survey of the past. I concur with them, and in the judgment that he has been weak towards the strong, strong towards the weak, silent when Russia or the Versailles government were in question, violent against Naples and Turkey.

What more feeble than his list of our national misdeeds given at Greenwich? It is easy to balance an account in your favour if you omit important items, and why were India and Ireland left out of Mr. Gladstone's list? If introduced, would they have warranted his conclusion? I cannot forget, either, his sympathy with the slaveholder which led him to raise his voice on the side of the South in the great American contest. Yet what is slavery, as an industrial institution not domestic, in any case, French, Spanish, Portuguese, English or Dutch? It is on their most revolting side, that of lust, the Bulgarian horrors in permanence. Female honour is not for the slave. So true is it, that one great critical suffering affects our imagination and arouses our sympathy, when the slow enduring evil under which generation after generation is borne down passes comparatively unnoticed.

Nor is the honour of England so compromised, whatever Mr. Gladstone may say, by what has happened in Bulgaria, as by numerous other parts of her conduct. It was far more palpably at stake in Jamaica, India, and that semi-Indian outrage, the Abyssinian raid. It is so in our opium policy in China, in our oppression of Burmah. There is ample field in these last for Mr. Gladstone's solicitude about it. Not that I object to his speaking in this present emergency, but there is that in the way in which he speaks as against the Government, which such reminiscences should prevent, and they are introduced to justify the withholding of our confidence.

Graver still—if we consider all that it involves—is the retrospect of his foreign policy. In thinking of him as the possible director of our foreign policy, are we warranted by his antecedents in hoping much from him? I put aside the curious act by which he would begin, an act, as Mr. Grant Duff justly observes, of direct war upon Turkey—a somewhat intemperate opening.

I turn to the past. If we may judge by some recriminations which passed between him and the present Premier, his colleagues and his opponents did not estimate highly his action at the time of the Crimean war.¹ If I remember right, the attack was warded by a remark that at that period he did not take much interest in foreign politics. But during his own Premiership such interest was forced upon him, and his then policy was, I must think, disastrous, and at the root of much of the present difficulty. It fell to him to

(1) In judging the Crimean War we are too apt to confound two distinct series of events, the protection of Turkey from Russian encroachment, and the aggression upon Russia herself by sending our forces to the Crimea. It is this latter which is properly the Crimean War, and which is a fair object of censure, as in every respect an unwise venture, with no good prospect: The former is and was justifiable on all grounds.

steer England through the crisis of the Franco-German war; and the general judgment at home and abroad was, and is, that he failed gravely. The temporary effacement of England—such is the expression which presents the position he gave his country, to the imperilling for long years of European concert, and to the necessitating his actual adoption of an unsound policy. It shows the short memory, or the inattention, or the excessive good nature of the nation, that it should be possible for the idea to arise, that a statesman so tried and so found wanting could again be entrusted with the highest power.

As it is, owing to the unfortunate blunder of Germany in 1871 and to the tame acquiescence of Europe in her pretensions, the Russo-Prussian combination has been encouraged to think itself the ultimate appeal, free to act as it pleased in reference to eastern Europe. The present policy of Mr. Gladstone, so far as we can gather it from his speeches, would favour its claims. His compliments all round must be taken for what they are worth; but his action would be to rely on Russia mainly in the arrangement with Turkey. I would make no hobgoblin of Russia; but it is excusable to doubt whether in the game of Eastern complications Mr. Gladstone would be a match for Prince Gortschakoff.

Be this as it may, he avows that he looks to the joint action of England and Russia in the present emergency, and there is a large school which would follow him in this. Let me indicate one objection *in limine* to this policy. I assume that Mr. Gladstone, if in power, would not carry out the wilder scheme of those who are at his back, nor seek to eject the Turks by violence from Europe, nor sanction Russia in so doing. I assume, that is,—as I interpret his language, I am warranted in assuming—that he so far accepts the “as you were” policy, as to look for modifications of the Turkish rule compatible with its existence. Now, Russia has been almost from its earliest entry into European politics the standing aggressor on Turkey, constantly encroaching on her, constantly domineering over her, in no ambiguous manner posing as her successor. Relatively Turkey is inferior in strength to Russia, and has witnessed with just alarm the growth of her opponent, and submitted, but with just indignation, to her dictatorial language. It is possible—Mr. Gladstone’s faith is strong in her, but I should have thought Lord Granville’s experience might have weakened it;—it is possible that Russia has abandoned her traditional policy and speaks merely in the interests of justice and humanity. Her conduct in Servia is singularly against this great change in her. She could, it is silly to doubt it, have stopped her officers and soldiers from turning a Servian into a Russian attack on Turkey. But it is not in the nature of

things that Turkey should accept without repugnance the influence of Russia. What she could yield honourably to the union of the more Western powers—of Europe in the truest sense—she would bitterly resent if imposed upon her by her haughty rival. Where it is possible to avoid rousing a not unwarranted suspicion and irritation, it is surely wise to do so, and it is so in this case, if we mingle as little as may be Russia with our action. With the wisest attempering, that action will be galling enough to the self-love of the Ottoman nation; it is but fair and also more prudent, more hopeful of result, to conciliate to the uttermost its feelings.

Turning to the Government in whose hands we actually are, it is not needful to examine with equal fulness its claims or its merits in the past. Mr. Gladstone tends, I do not say seeks, to supplant it; and we would know why. It is in power, and all that is necessary is to see whether it be so far inferior to the substitute offered as at a critical moment to make it imperative to change it. In point of humanity, no one would accuse the members of the existing Government of being less sensible to the Bulgarian horrors than any other men who have read them. In their position a certain amount of reticence was necessary, as I cannot but think there is a similar obligation resting on the leaders of the Opposition, who are always possible ministers.

For their general record, it is not better, so far as I can see, nor worse, than Mr. Gladstone's. They have condoned all the wrongs which he has condoned, have shared in the national misdoings as largely as he; possibly rather more. Here and there, as in his case, there have been exceptions. But in general, what I think Mr. Spencer calls the bias of patriotism has had free play with the present ministers as with their assailants, and the dictates of humanity and the exigencies of our country's honour in reference to them have been far too much ignored. And I fear will be ignored; for with the present Premier's oriental proclivities, which lead him to cling so strongly to our Indian empire that he has saddled us with that odious title of Empress of India, there is little hope of a moderate, really humane policy in the East. And in the West the affair of Luxemburg, and their silence during the Franco-German war, are far from reassuring. Yet with all deductions, I think the general opinion has been hitherto, and there seems no reason to doubt should continue to be, that so far as regards the honour of England—a very delicate ground to tread on—it is safer with the actual Government than with its predecessor. They seem less smitten with that curious defect which is traceable in so many of the economical school of statesmen—the men who look to exports and imports as the one test of national well-being—the defect of any historical conception,

any constant sense of the importance of a well-matured foreign policy.

At any rate, the ministers who now direct our foreign action have not been exposed to the trial, and have therefore escaped the failure of their predecessors, and there is so far more ground for hope that they will carry us well through the present storm. All that has hitherto appeared warrants—broadly speaking—this conclusion. It is much that they have not lost their self-possession, and that they venture, in contact with this present tumult, to weigh the real merits of the case, and to risk no rash judgments. It is refreshing to turn to their speeches after those of their assailants: I allude to Lord Derby's and Sir Stafford Northcote's. On the details of their actions it is very dangerous for a private citizen to enter, but I cannot but think—speaking only of the act so far as it is open to public cognisance—that their refusal of the Berlin Memorandum was a wise measure. It was most desirable, if England was to speak with effect in the councils of Europe, to show that she in no way looked on herself as taken in tow by the imperial combination of Eastern Europe—that she was an independent power, choosing her own time and mode of action—that she was no longer effaced, but present and to be reckoned with. Such an attitude is the first condition of better things—that it will be the first step towards them, this must remain uncertain. So again, the sending of her fleet to Besika Bay, and that in great force, merits the applause it gained. On the particular combination of motives I have no call to enter. But its presence there, yes, in some sense as the ally of Turkey, if only the Government use it rightly, is again a necessary preliminary to a sound intervention—obviating, probably, many embarrassments.

With Mr. Gladstone—I am happy to note my agreement,—and perhaps before Mr. Gladstone, I think the prestige of England a mischievous and immoral idea. I renounce all care for England's selfish interests. I invite him to carry out his renunciation to its fair consequences. But with him, too, I make no doubt, I wish England strong and respected. It is for the interest of Europe and Humanity that it should be so. I welcome, by the way, the more frequent introduction of this term Humanity, the implicit recognition of its reality, in contradistinction to, and yet on the same footing with, other smaller, but avowedly real, aggregations of men. I wish, I have ever wished, that England should be as strong as she was under Cromwell, but without any of the aggressive tendencies which vitiated the great Protector's foreign policy; and it is because I think that the measures of the present Government are calculated to replace her in a position in which she may be signally

useful, and so repair the mischief wrought by a feebler administration, that I do what I can in its support. Statesmanship must be a balance of evils in many cases, and it is often necessary to prefer a general result of permanent value to the removal of even deplorable immediate evils. Were it, then, shown that certain incidental evils accompanied the action of the Government, it would not be its conclusive condemnation.

But, of course, all depends ultimately on the use made of a strong position; and any interpretation of the Ministry's conduct must be subject to their future action. What their intentions and policy may be, we have almost of necessity to wait for. Any criticism solely concerns the past and passing events. What is to be wished for—in other words, what the policy of England should be—this is the question on which I now enter.

I have already said that from the school which gravitates towards Russia I wholly dissent; and I have dwelt on the peculiar inappropriateness of calling her in in the treatment of Turkey. What is there in the past history or present condition of Russia that should make her an object of our political preferences? Within her own sphere, and in the arduous task of raising her population and wisely administering her already unwieldy empire, there is every reason to wish her well, and when possible to aid her; but her continued expansion can be no object to anyone. She has not shown in Poland any peculiar ability in dealing with a more advanced people which was sacrificed to her ambition; why should she be competent to rule wisely the Rouman or the Greek? Her population was within these twenty years serf, and the dispositions of her ruling classes and her emancipated peasants are not likely to have been so modified from what they were during the long continuance of serfage, as to make them suitable rulers and guides of others. Was the condition of the serfs in Russia much, if any, better than that of the rayahs under Turkish rule? There is every reason to doubt it. Ruling classes which so recently held their inferiors in such dependence as, I believe, existed in Russia, must take time to unlearn their habits, as must those who have so long crouched to learn the habits of freemen. It is not a quarter of a century that, under the conditions of Russia, intellectually and morally, will undo the work of generations.

Again, the religious organisation of Russia singularly disqualifies her for dealing aright with the various Christian populations of the Turkish empire. Nowhere is the spiritual power so completely fused with the temporal—God and Cæsar so inseparable. It is clear from recent events that there is in Islam even less of this intimate blending of the two powers. If allowed, not to encourage in the interest of her own policy the discontent of the Christians,

but really to incorporate them in her empire, where would be the freedom which they now enjoy under the Moslem toleration, contemptuous toleration granted, but still toleration? From its acute perception of this feature in Russian policy, a perception sharpened by her experience in Poland, the Roman Catholic Church sides with the Turk as against the Christian Russians, with a more just estimate of the value of their Christianity than many of us have who suffer ourselves to be misled by that vague term. But even were there no such objections, why should the various divisions of the southern population — Roumans, Bulgarians, Servians, Bosnians, Greeks, Turks, &c.—why should they come under Russian domination and swell the forces of the Pan-Slavic movement. We must acquiesce in the inevitable; but a wise policy will, I conceive, not forward any vast Slavonian aggregate, which, under present circumstances and feelings, may be a most serious danger to Germany, and through her to European peace. New powers, conscious of strength, and impelled only by an instinct of growth, are not wisely encouraged by neighbours at whose expense they must grow, especially when they can offer no contribution of value. If with such a power, unwisely developed, Germany were in hostility, the struggle were most deplorable for both. If she were in unison with it, she would lose rather than gain by the contract, and the combination would be most formidable for all Western Europe.

It is, in my judgment, the true interest, both for themselves and for Europe, of the subject states of Turkey at present to remain so, always under the supposition that a tolerable existence is given them. Even for Bosnia and Herzegovina, where the difficulty is greatest, and another solution the most defensible, I, for one, should acquiesce in the judgment of the powers if they found some arrangement by which their connection with Turkey remained unsevered. For Bulgaria, I should deprecate its severance, even to the extent to which the two former might be separated. The unwise impatience of Servia goes to show that her comparative independence was premature. It was never given her that she might be a fire-brand in Europe, and be made the instrument of an unjustifiable war. Sufficient control for the present must be allowed the imperial state to prevent such dangers.

I hope, then, that, in no spirit of opposition to Russia, but guided by the whole antecedents of our past history, England will not rely on her mainly, nor at all, in her action towards Turkey, but will, as befits a great Western power, look to the other Western powers, France, Italy, Austro-Hungary, Germany—(I wish I could add Spain, in fact I would add Spain,—and the other Western powers would be wise in inviting her concurrence, in replacing her, as Italy

was placed in 1856, at the council table of Europe)—for her legitimate coadjutors in the task of modifying Turkish misgovernment. It is difficult to redeem the past, and such a concert of all is well-nigh hopeless, but a firm and patient policy might do much to re-establish the union which on a former occasion proved so effective, and to make it the basis for a further reunion of the West. Combined more immediately with France and Italy, the two powers which before rescued Turkey, England with them might address the Porte in the name of the obligation then contracted, and concert with her such a scheme as might effectually remove the evils complained of, so far as governmental action can remove them, securing for her subject peoples the orderly administration under which they might grow to be capable of self-direction. No one of these three powers could be suspected of any design of occupying the empire they were protecting; they would not, therefore, in combination give any legitimate umbrage to their European compeers. They have lost twenty years, but this is not fatal; it is a short period in a nation's history. They may take up the work which they should have done twenty years ago.

If it was possible then—and all assume that it was—it is possible now, so to act on Turkey as to render her internal government essentially tolerable. It is not for me to sketch in detail the measures which would effect this. I can only register the fact that all the language used by the denunciators of Turkey does assume that such measures might have been taken, and that our responsibility for recent occurrences consists in their not having been taken. Some things would have to be undone. Is there not, for instance, a considerable burden resting on Europe in regard to the powers it has claimed for its consuls in Turkey? Has there not been much disorganization consequent on our overbearing assertion of the rights of our fellow-citizens, in defiance of the just claims of the Porte to self-direction. I mention these points because I think that the intervening powers would be bound to show the greatest possible respect for the independent action of Turkey, forbearing all unnecessary evidence of their influence, and conciliating, where possible, by a wise return on the past.

The union of the three powers first named for joint action on Turkey—with no wish to exclude the others, with every wish rather to have their co-operation—is, I must think, more in keeping with past history and with the present interests of Europe than would be the one against which I am arguing; and, lastly, it would be surely more agreeable to the power most immediately concerned. Nor can I imagine that, if properly addressed, either France or Italy would stand aloof from such a combination. It would tend, as I

have before hinted, to strengthen the unstable equilibrium of Europe, and in the best way, by calling into activity its more advanced portions.

But it implies that I wish the continued existence of European Turkey; and it is this from which the dominant sentiment of the nation, at any rate of the English meetings, is, I suspect, averse. But I think there are grounds for wishing it from many points of view. Whatever the judgment on the arguments urged, I feel still a confident hope that, thanks to the action of our Government, the mad attempt—mad not in the sense that it might not succeed, but on a forecast of the evils it would entail in the succeeding, and after the success—will not at present be made: the attempt, I mean, forcibly to eject the Turks. So that we may well hope for time for discussion of the problem.

I deprecate, as I have said, even the bag and baggage theory, the total withdrawal, that is to say, of Bulgaria from Turkish rule, where it is said that the immediate past has made its continuance impossible. May we not take a hint from a disagreeable episode in our own history? The closest parallel with the Turkish suppression of the Bulgarian insurrection is afforded by our own suppression of the Irish rebellion of 1798. I wonder how many of the speakers at these public meetings have studied the records of that event. They are not difficult of access; and had they been known, some of those speakers must have modified their denunciations—not so much of the particular atrocities, as of the nation and government under which they were perpetrated. The Irish horrors followed, with a short and brighter interval, a long period of oppressive misgovernment, which we too easily condone—the period of the celebrated penal laws. They led to the Act of Union, and by no indirect consequence to a different treatment of Ireland. Its full adoption was delayed for a generation, but it was in the series of the consequences of the rebellion, and was forced on by that event. May we not hope similarly that, horrible as were the misdoings in Bulgaria, they may issue, with the temperate aid of Europe as above indicated, in securing for that province a really ameliorated government. Nations, like individuals, are aroused by some great crisis or sin, and amendment may be the consequence. Certain it is, that if length of failure be a ground for immediate expulsion, it was more applicable to us in reference to Ireland than to Turkey in Bulgaria. For both alike I wish, I believe in, ultimate independence. I reprobate for both all language, I dissent from all action, which should close this prospect. I think English statesmen and Turkish statesmen should prepare for and forward its attainment; but when in England we hear it boldly proclaimed, as it was

by Mr. Forster, that we never will let Ireland go, can we wonder if in Turkey convulsive efforts are made to hold Bulgaria?

If the provinces are cut entirely loose, left to their own self-government, they are exposed to the probabilities of quarrels with their neighbours, to the almost certainty of intrigues from without. If their existence was disorderly, either internally or in relation to one another, the great border powers would soon interfere, and once incorporated in one of them they would have but a distant hope of their independence. I believe that Bulgaria, at any rate, feels this, and that with some moderate but real security for a better government they would be glad to be free from foreign intrigues, and to nurse themselves for the future. After all there is considerable toleration in the Turkish central government, as is evidenced by the action of the American missionaries and the establishment of schools of the non-dominant faith. In fact, by every account of the condition of Bulgaria, it was, before its unhappy insurrection, healthily growing under the Turkish sway. The want is, a thorough quickening of the central action, so as to check the action of the local administration—a want, be it observed, not peculiar to Turkey. In all countries I fear, in their present moral condition, self-government means scarcely more than the government of the strong, more or less oppressive to the weak; our own country certainly is no exception. Such a quickening of the central administration in Turkey I believe quite possible.

Such is the conclusion I advocate for the various smaller states ulteriorly to issue from the Turkish rule. We cannot at a moment's notice change the relations or undo the effects of centuries. Much of the language applicable to Western Europeans would be out of place in dealing with these Eastern peoples, who have not passed through the discipline which has modified the West.

But what, leave these Christian populations under Mahommedan rule? The cry comes not from the statesmen on either side, it must be said, though there is too much about the peculiar modification of Islam in the Turk, but it represents, I suspect, much of the feeling which is stirring our country. Nor with many does it stop there. It would go to the utter expulsion of the Turks from Europe, as a contamination of the soil of Christendom, a soil over which none but so-called Europeans should hold sway. I do not share the feeling, quite the contrary; and I think it fraught with most evil consequences in the present, and for a long period of the future.

I proceed to explain myself on this most difficult subject. The two faiths, the faith of Christ and the faith of Allah—the religion of St. Paul and the religion of Mahommed—are both to be respected for their services; each has its peculiar merits. If the Eastern creed is simpler

and nobler as a doctrine than the Western, the utility of the latter is I think greater, or has been greater, owing to the inheritance it received and the conditions of its propagation. If in some respects, it is unquestionable that the nations of the West are in advance of the Moslems, it is hardly to the difference in their religion that we can fairly impute their superiority. There was a time when the disciples of Islam were distinctly in the van of civilisation, in the points where now they are most behind the West, and there was a time when in all the moral qualities they were certainly not inferior. Even in the fierce wars between the Christian and the Mussulman, neither the physical nor moral preeminence was always on the side of the former. I will take a capital instance. I recall the striking scene when in the city of Jehovah the Crescent and the Cross met in deadly struggle. Christian historians have made no secret of the complete triumph of all the fiercer passions over the precepts of Christianity. They have not hesitated to paint the victors as at least the equals in barbarity of the vanquished. "No age or sex spared, seventy thousand said to have been the number of the victims." This for the darker side of both. On the brighter, the equality, to say the least of it, of some of the Moslems had not escaped the fair mind of Sir Walter Scott. He has not scrupled to make the Prince of Scotland inferior to his Moslem rival by virtue of the somewhat brutal contempt which contrasts so unfavourably with Saladin's courteous toleration of an antagonist's faith.

Such being their relation in the past, the two creeds have now for many centuries rested quietly side by side, each directing its own portion of the world. Deliberately, I do not believe any one would wish to revive their hostilities. But does not all this abuse of the Turks tend that way? For at the head of the Moslems, as a political power with certain latent capacities, the Turks have long stood and stand, and unmeasured denunciations may call those latent capacities into action, and inflict on the world a war in which fanaticism should be one of the motive powers. I have no fear that any such risk would be run by a wise pressure of the more friendly Western powers, in the name of the purely human interests of peace, order, and good government; and were there some risk, it might be incumbent on us to confront it, with such aims.

But there is more than this. The alienation of the East from the West, of Asia from Europe, is not diminishing in these later years, but is on the increase rather;—as a result of the coarse and oppressive intrusion of our industrial society, the offensive iteration of our claims to superiority, lastly of our spirit of conquest. I am not speaking of England exclusively. A reaction against us is possible, even probable; and if there is none, yet enforced submission is

covert hatred, and all real union of the two worlds is out of the question. At once Asiatic and European, as a consequence of its position and history, the Turkish nation offers us a test of the spirit in which the stronger West is disposed to deal with the more disorganized families of man. It has shown, and its present weakness is largely due to this cause, a wish to enter more completely into the European family, and to propagate its influence further eastward. Wise statesmanship, guided by an instinct of what was good for Humanity, for the whole race, would avail itself of this existing intermedium, even though not the best that could be wished, but as the only one ready to hand. Far from seeking to eject the Turks from Europe, it would see in them a means for smoothing the differences between the continents, the races, and the creeds—for breaking down the barriers which now separate the various portions of mankind, and for showing that one common Humanity could override all minor differences. I say not that any statesmanship by itself can effectually secure this result, but it might work towards it with what the past has handed down, rather than under an ill-governed impulse throw aside what we have, and launch itself on new and uncertain combinations.

Any such considerations are alien and probably distasteful to the Christian mind. I am addressing mainly what I may call inorganic Christians, not the sagacious organisation of Papal Rome. Yet it is clear that no purely Christian policy can avail us here. The extermination of the Moslems is not more impossible than is their conversion to the Christian faith, in which they would see—it sounds strangely to Christians—a retrogradation. If there is to be harmony provisionally, we must consult so large a portion of the earth's inhabitants which, and I deplore the fact, grows rapidly; in fact more rapidly than the Christians; the relative growth does not interest me. We must make it manifest that we have a common ground with them, community of interests and feelings; that we in no sense claim to be different beings, and if in any way we are superior, seek only to impart our superiority. We have then to accept and honour their faith as one of the facts of our complex existence, to understand and respect their social organisation, to learn what they have to teach us—and all observers allow that there is something—and to teach what they have to learn. We are told that we ought to shake hands with Russia as a brave and honourable opponent. Most true; but extend the teaching; widen the area of your sympathies. Let Christendom and Islam, also brave and honourable foes in the past, also shake hands and agree to put aside their antagonism. The initiative is and must be with Christendom, with the West. So far no one would contest. If the conclusion is

one from which the popular instinct as yet revolts, this only shows how weak we are in toleration,—how there still lurks in us, under all our language of peace, the instinct of domination,—how, in spite of all our claims to enlightenment, we are animated by a contemptuous intolerance of the convictions of others.

Herein, and in the source from which such feelings spring, the confident presumption of the exclusive truth of the prevalent creed, lies a powerful obstacle to human unity, baffling the wiser counsels of the statesman as well as the aspirations of mankind. Yet not destined to baffle them finally, and all steps towards its removal that are possible should be taken. Least of all should any backward steps be taken, and I much fear that we are in the way to take such backward steps, to shatter one of the combinations which, not the traditional policy of England at present in such disfavour, but the instinctive wisdom of generations of European statesmen has bequeathed us.

But the Turks—if it were only this, that, or the other branch of the Mahomedans, and not the Turks—the one great anti-human specimen of humanity! Christians surely should be slow to speak so. What becomes of St. Paul's declaration, probably not questioned by Mr. Gladstone, that God has made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth? Such, however, is the decorous and moderate language used by a possible premier of England, the noblest, we are told by Mr. Fawcett in his unworthy speech, and the best of Englishmen, to whom we are to look for guidance in the crisis, and whose accession to power with such an utterance unretracted is well nigh a declaration of war upon Turkey. What a dangerous element is the rhetorical statesman, the man in whom the organ of expression overbalances the higher faculties. Well, the Turks—you must accept them, there they are—approximately twelve millions of men, whom Mr. Gladstone thus attacks. The practical ruler has to deal with existing materials, and were the nation justly designated as above, it is with it that we have to reckon. But the judgment even in the past is entirely overstrained, and in the present it is a pure anachronism—an expression of a mediæval reminiscence, nay, below the level of the highest mediæval conceptions, even when the alarm was yet justifiably strong. I am not called, however, by my argument to defend the Turks when I repudiate such a monstrous exaggeration. I have only to urge that, be they what they may, it is our duty to observe towards them the common human respect, and our duty and our interest to bring them into co-operation with us for the common good. Certain animal races have to be extirpated as irreconcilable with man. It is a sad necessity. Certain races of men have been

extirpated, not by Turks, but by colonial Englishmen; others are in process of disappearance; but only one speaker, so far as I have seen, has called for the extirpation of the Turks as we extirpated the wolf, and the human feeling of my countrymen cherishes no such atrocious thought.

They must remain, then, in Europe or out of Europe—another fact of our complex existence—to be recognised as an object for true statesmanship, pending a deeper and more powerful action. That the fact should be not merely recognised, but welcomed as, with all drawbacks, a valuable element towards solving the difficult problem of the union of mankind—on this I will not insist further.

The essential obstacle to that union lies in the existence of different faiths, and in the moral attitude which that difference ordinarily involves, the opposition between Christianity and Islam being its most capital instance. In the dilapidated state of Christian belief in the rulers of Europe, who cling to it more as a social power than from mental conviction, there ought to be no difficulty in either of these respects; they can, as their predecessors have done, treat the matter on purely human grounds. And the populations at their back will be no real embarrassment if judiciously dealt with, as they are in reality swayed mainly by human motives. The task, therefore, of Western statesmen is far easier in regard to any approximation to Islam, than is that of the Islamic leaders in approaching Christendom. Behind these latter the mass is sincerely animated by an attachment to the dogmas of its creed, so easily comprehended, so capable of taking deep root, so interwoven with all their daily life. Great straightforwardness, great patience, great respect are necessary, both in the chiefs of this mass and in the leaders of the West, in the approaches made to them. With all precautions the progress must be slow; but it is too much in the course of events, in the wants of Humanity, that some union should be effected, for the attempt to fail. It must evidently be first made by those for whom it is the easiest. And the first step is the removal of irritation and alarm—all elements of suspicion. No shadow of a proselytising spirit should be perceptible—not the remotest ground given for thinking their faith attacked or undervalued.

So relative a spirit is a hard thing to reconcile with Christianity. Hence the necessity for its ultimate disappearance as a hindrance to the union so much desired.

But enough on this point. It may be that, as it has been predicted, the Turks will themselves return to Asia, or it may be that, under a nobler faith, they may remain in peaceful juxtaposition with the other co-existent peoples—conquerors and conquered merging in one political body, their past differences forgotten in present union.

So long as they stay where they are, and keep their actual faith, they have a great value, not felt now for the first time, as enforcing the necessity, even within the limits of Europe, of rising into a region above the two antagonist religions of the past. If suddenly we suppose them removed to Asia, this necessary step in human advance might be adjourned, not pressed, so immediately on the attention of statesmen. The two continents, already so opposed in common thought, would be in more complete isolation one from the other, and the disposition of the European to condemn and domineer over the Asiatic would not be confronted by a yet considerable European power. Nor, again, would the difficulties their presence creates have been turned to the best account by meeting them and overcoming them; they would have disappeared, but leaving an unsatisfactory sense of want of competence—a discouragement for the future; whereas, rightly solved, they would have been a guarantee of subsequent progress.

Such are some of the considerations which I offer in favour of the *status quo*, wisely modified, and against any abrupt cutting of the knot.

They evidently are not limited to the immediate present, any more than they are based on a view bounded by the immediate past. The ultimate aim being the unity of Humanity, all the intermediate steps must be judged by reference to it. Our advance towards that aim has been continuous in the past when no such goal was recognised, or but faintly recognised, and by few. Now that it has come into more general cognisance and may be made the object of conscious effort, everything that can intensify the continuity of the advance is of importance, every available transmission from the past preserved. Above all, no violent disruption should be tolerated, when it is possible by human foresight to avoid it.

It is in this conservative spirit that I have written, not unduly conservative I hope. For I wish for very large modifications in the state of the subject populations of eastern Europe, and I look for gradual changes in the directions which past changes have taken. But daily does the conviction grow stronger, that in this case as in many others, we are too exclusively bent on political changes when a change of a different order is the real want—a moral and religious renovation—the fruitful and direct source of social and political changes of which we scarcely now dream.

Acquiescence in very defective political arrangements is often most desirable at the present day. Acquiescence, but with judicious attempts at modification. The first need is to influence the rulers, the dominant powers, be they individuals or nations; to bring home to them their great duty of preparing ~~those~~ they rule for a higher

